REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 488 48

REVISIONS OF THE ALLP FRENCH PROGRAM AND SECOND TRIAL USE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKON, 1964-65.

BY- MUELLER, THEODORE H.
UNIVERSITY OF AKRON, OHIO
REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-89-1 PUB DATE AUG 65
CONTRACT OEC-5-14-007
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$4.60 115P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FRENCH, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE TESTS, *PROGRAMED MATERIALS, *PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION, TEST VALIDITY, AUTOINSTRUCTIONAL AIDS, *AUTOINSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, SPEECH SKILLS, AKRON, OHIO, ALLP FRENCH PROGRAM (REVISED)

REVISIONS OF "THE ALLP FRENCH PROGRAM" (A 1-YEAR PROGRAMED COURSE FOR THE COLLEGE AND ADULT LEVEL EMPHASIZING ORAL SKILLS) AND THE RESULTS OF A SECOND TRAIL USE OF THE REVISED PROGRAM WERE REPORTED. THE REVISED FRANCH PROGRAM WAS DESIGNED TO OVERCOME THE SHORTCOMINGS OF THE ORIGINAL PROGRAM AND SOUGHT TO BE MORE EFFECTIVE, LESS TIME CONSUMING, AND MORE ACCEPTABLE TO THE STUDENTS. THE QUESTION OF TOTAL SELF-INSTRUCTION VERSUS VARIOUS COMBINATIONS OF CLASS AND LABORATORY SITUATIONS WAS CONSIDERED. SEVERAL POSSIBILITIES OF STAFFING THE CLASS AND LABORATORY WERE CONSIDERED. TRIAL USE OF "THE REVISED ALLP FRENCH PROGRAM" PROVED QUITE SUCCESSFUL ON THE COLLEGE LEVEL, AND THE DROPOUT RATE WAS SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED. ALTHOUGH RELIANCE ON SELF-INSTRUCTION WAS REDUCED AND A GREATER ROLE ASSIGNED TO THE INSTRUCTOR, THE PROGRAM PROMISES EVENTUALLY TO ACCOMMODATE LARGE CLASSES AT THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION WITHOUT AFFECTING THE EXCELLENCE OF RESULTS. THE PROGRAM ALSO PROMISES THE USE OF STAFF TIME WITH GREATER EFFICIENCY, THUS REDUCING INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS. RELATED INFORMATION MAY BE FOUND IN ED 010 487. (GD)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ED010488

Revisions of the

ALLP French Program

and Second Trial Use at the

University of Akron

1964-65

Theodore H. Mueller
Principal Investigator

Title VI
National Defense Education Act of 1958
Contract No. OE 5-14-007

University of Akron
Akron, Ohio

August 1965

The research reported herein was supported by a grant from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Introduction 1

I. Problem 1

II. Summary of relevant work 2

III. Project staff 5

IV. Description of the revisions 6

V. Procedures 13

VI. Observations and suggestions 18

VII. Results
  A. Results of the experimental group 31
  B. Comparison of experimental and control MLT results . 35
  C. Structural analysis of free speech and writing . . . 37
  D. Correlation between aptitude and results 38
  E. Drop-out study 41

VIII. General acceptance 44

IX. Conclusions 45

Appendices
  A. Evaluations
    1. Edgar Mayer, University of Buffalo: results at end of first semester A-1
    2. Frederick Eddy, Georgetown University: results at end of second semester A-3
    3. Robert Harris, Psychologist, University of Akron: student attitude survey A-22
  B. The Revised French Program
    1. Table of contents to Parts I and II B-1
       Table of contents to Parts III and IV B-2
    2. List of materials eliminated from original Program B-8
       List of frames replaced B-8
  C. Tests administered C-1
  D. Tables relating students' aptitude and results . . D-1

LIST OF TABLES

page
Table 1 32
Table 2 35
Table 3 36
Table 4 37
Table 5 38
Table 6 39
Table 7 39
Table 8 41
Table 9 . . . . 42 - 43

INTRODUCTION

The research reported herein concerns the revisions of the ALLP French Program and a second trial use of the Revised Program at the University of Akron. It contains many observations and comments that might be helpful to those who will use this Program in the future.

The results obtained with college students are compared by means of the MLA test with the results of our traditional first year college classes. Other areas of comparison, particularly drop-out rate, are investigated. This research thus continues, to some extent, research about drop-outs performed at the University of Florida together with Professor Ralph Leutenegger and reported in the Modern Language Journal of 1964.

Suggestions about the Program are made with the view toward eventual publication by a publishing company. Although the present Revised ALLP French Program proved to be very successful, it could well be improved in several areas, particularly by better integrating the four different parts.

Further improvements and much more research are needed in the implementation of programmed learning on a college level. A greater reduction in the drop-out rate should be one of the principal aims of such research since the present trial use clearly demonstrated that students with low ability succeed very well if they stay with this Program.

I. Problem

The "Experimental Self-Instructional Programmed Course in Contemporary Spoken French" was produced under Project ALLP II, Contract No. OE 3-14-012, under the direction of F. Rand Morton, University of Michigan. It had a number of trial uses in the NDEA Summer Institutes at the University of Florida and at the University of Massachusetts during the summer of 1963 and at the University of Akron during the academic year 1963-64. These trial uses were carefully analyzed; a record of errors and of work throughs of each frame was kept; periodic tests were administered. The student's language behavior was analyzed and each student was interviewed by the Head of the Department to ascertain his reactions. The information thus gathered formed the basis of revisions and of revised procedures in a second trial use during the academic year 1964-65.

This first trial use pointed out the areas in which the Program needed to be improved. Extensive revisions were proposed for Part I (pronunciation) to reduce the time needed for acquiring the new pronunciation habits, to increase the efficiency of the exercises and to eliminate some of the speech deficiencies still prevalent in the speech of the students; revisions were proposed for Part III (morphemic structures) to improve the effectiveness of the exercises drilling the verb patterns and to better satisfy the students' questions about French structure. Revised procedure in the dialogues were intended to improve oral comprehension of materials containing unknown vocabulary items. Additions were made to the Program aimed at improving the reading and writing skills.

The administration of the Program needed further attention. A number of safeguards had to be introduced to offset the student's lack of responsibility. Techniques of interpersonal communication needed to be developed. More frequent and better tests were needed to assure that the student progressed only after having mastered a body of material.

The Revised French Program was designed to overcome the shortcomings of the original Program: deficiencies in pronunciation, poor control over a number of morphemic structures, discouragement engendered by the Program, the absence of the writing skill, and the only average performance in the reading skill. It sought to make the Program more effective, less time consuming, and more acceptable to the students.

The second trial use with a group of college students and adults was designed to test the Revised French Program, and to further revise the final product. The goal was to establish the most effective administrative procedures for use with programmed materials in view of eventually handling greater numbers of students without increase in staff. The question of total self-instruction versus various combinations of class and laboratory situations was considered and several possibilities of staffing the class and laboratory were investigated.

The Revised French Program and the second trial use had two primary objectives:

1. Improvement of student performance in all four skills over the performance usually obtained in our classes taught with good audio-lingual materials and methods.
2. Reduction of the percentage of students dropping out of first year classes.

Other questions were also investigated: performance in the Intermediate French course by those students who had had their first course through the French Program, the effect of reading and writing on pronunciation and performance in general, and a possible shorter program for gifted students.

II. Summary of Relevant Work

A number of studies are relevant to the revisions and administration of programmed learning: Pimsleur's study (1961) found that discrimination training with certain sounds "did not render laboratory practice measurably more effective in producing good pronunciation." He suggests that the problem is "not one of discrimination but one of differentiation." The proper pronunciation was improved by practicing the sound.

It is not suggested that discrimination has no place in a program. Hebb (1949), referring to the work done in visual perception, introduces the concept of "phase sequences" which he describes as the formation of synaptic junctures in the neural cells. His term "identity" best describes the process effected by discrimination training. By forcing the student to make fine distinctions the identity of each phoneme is well established.

Valdman (1963) argues for an earlier introduction of the French writing system, as soon as the pronunciation habits are established. He points out that the spelling system is closely related to the syntax of the language.

It is well known that a number of students are visual minded. Sawyer (1962) concludes that there are indications that students may benefit from training with a text before them, especially if they are trained in a laboratory with reduced motivation and reduced social stimulation. Articulatory fluency as well as the learning of meanings and syntax appeared to benefit from the availability of a text.

Fernand Marty (1962), after trial of his program at Hollins College notes certain drawbacks to self-tutorial learning: 1. Students miss the student-teacher relationship. 2. Reinforcement by a machine is not sufficient to provide high motivation. Students would have been better off if they had been periodically supplied with "public reinforcement." 3. Too much time was consumed in detecting errors, and there was also a failure to detect errors with sufficient accuracy. 4. Students were dissatisfied with communication only with a machine.

Salzman (1964), in experimenting with his Russian Program at the University of Washington, likewise reports the irregular attendance and high drop-out rate of adult students who had "purchased" laboratory time to learn Russian, unless time schedules were established for the individual. To judge from his observation, it seems that extrinsic motivation was an essential missing feature for students who did not meet in class.

Robert Harris, serving as consultant to the French Program at the University of Akron, substantiates the need for extrinsic reinforcement in an attitude survey conducted among the students enrolled in the French Program. His report is found in the appendix. He suggests that response shaping in small classes is likely to establish the "learning set" through which trial and error on the part of the learner will be reduced and the learning time shortened.

Paul Pimsleur in his study of "under-achievers" concludes that "auditory ability" is the special factor which makes for foreign language learning talent. He defines it as the ability to receive and process information through the ear. He lists two components constituting good auditory ability: sound discrimination and sound-symbol association. He concludes that auditory ability is an important factor in under-achievement and in the drop-out problem. He also raises the question of the relationship between motivation and the student's auditory ability.

Mueller and Leutenegger (1964) in their drop-out study found a correlation between the Tonal Memory and Time sub-tests of the Seashore Measures of Musical Talents, and the drop-outs. Their attitude survey and interviews with these students pointed out that the audio-lingual approach is one of the main difficulties for these students. They conclude that these students had too much trouble with learning through the ear exclusively. The conditioned oral responses required in the course caught them at their greatest weaknesses, namely oral memory.

Lane (1964), in his rigorously controlled laboratory studies, raises questions about the effects of discrimination learning. He points out the psychophysical differences in the perception of external and self-generated sounds which impede the development of accurate echoic behavior. He aduces his studies indicating that inadequate response differentiation can persist despite a very fine-grained discrimination repertoire. He cites the studies by Liberman at the Haskins Laboratories suggesting that speech is perceived by reference to articulation, that is, that the articulatory movements and their sensory effects mediate between the acoustic stimulus and perception.

Pimsleur, Mace, et al. (1963) point out that students are poor judges of their own pronunciation. They are prone to think their pronunciation good enough when actually it is not acceptable. Students are unable to note which features are relevant and which are not (p. 199).

Lane (1964) points out that there is inadequate evidence to confirm that the relevant discriminations, once conditioned, are effective in self-shaping echoic behavior -- self-shaping being the basic assumption of the French Program. Lanes' argument seems to suggest that if response differentiation techniques can be applied in a FL Program it will facilitate speech sound discrimination. Conversely, he points out that in the existing programs the development of echoic behavior skips from discrimination training to imitation with the intervening steps -- response differentiation and coordination -- largely omitted.

Although the above-mentioned research deals primarily with the learning of sounds, it seems equally applicable to the learning of grammatical structures consisting of given sound sequences. A provocative article by Asher seems to support the effectiveness of response shaping. He reports the hypothesis that the closer an item is to being learned on the very first presentation the greater the probability that the item will be retained. He also concludes that the practice before learning occurs has a cumulative negative effect on retention. If this hypothesis proves to be correct, every effort should be made to eliminate trial and error learning on the part of the student. Response shaping in class might well be the tool to "one-trial learning" to be followed afterwards by practice provided through the program in the laboratory.

The problem of using teachers in programmed learning received attention by Albert Valdman (1964). He finds that they are of limited use if they are not fluent and of near-native ability. He is concerned, however, primarily in leading the student from imitation of the model to "behaving the language," that is, using the language in free conversation. He has not considered the possibility of using the instructor for the specific purpose of response shaping.

Asher, James, Evidence for "Genuine" One-Trial Learning. IRAL I/2, 1963, 98-103.

Hebb, D. O., The Organization of Behavior -- A Neurophysiological Theory. John Wiley and Sons, 1949.

Marty, Fernand, Programmed Learning of a Second Language. IRAL II/4, 1964, 249-301.

Marty, Fernand, Programming a Basic Foreign Language Course; Prospects for Self-Instruction. Roanoke, Virginia: Audio-Visual Publications, 1962.

Mueller, Theodore and Leutenegger, Ralph, Some Inferences about an Intensified Oral Approach to the Teaching of French Based on a Study of Course Drop-outs. MLJ, 1964, 48, 91-94.

Pimsleur, Paul, Discrimination Training in the Teaching of French Pronunciation. Modern Language Journal, 1963, 47, 199-203.

Pimsleur, P.; Mace, L.; and Keislar, E.; Preliminary Discrimination Training in the Teaching of French Pronunciation. Unpublished report, U. S. Office of Education, 1961.

Pimsleur, P.; Mace, L.; and Keislar, E., Effect of Preliminary Training in Pronunciation Discrimination upon Learning of French Pronunciation. 1961, USOE.

Salzman, Irving, "Report on the Use of a Programmed Course in Russian." Unpublished report, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, 1964.

Sawyer, Jesse; Ervin, Susan; Silver, Shirley; D'Andrea, Joanne; Aoki, Harno, The Utility of Translation and Written Symbols During the First Thirty Hours of Language Study. University of California, Berkeley, 1962.

Valdman, Albert, "Not All Is Wrong with French Spelling," French Review, December 1963, 213-223.

Valdman, Albert, Toward Self-Instruction in Foreign Language Learning, IRAL II/1, 1964, 1-36.

III. Project Staff

The following people were employed for the revisions and the trial use of the Revised French Program: Miss Colleen Marshall, Project Secretary; Mrs. Mahine Lak, Student Assistant; Miss Annette Tolbert, Student Assistant; Miss Linda Hofle, Student Assistant; Mr. Bruce Brodsky, Recording Engineer; Mr. Luc de Lovinfosse, Informant working with the students in the language laboratory. Miss Pat Breen and Professor Robert Harris served as subjects trying out the revised portions of the Program. Professor Claude Meade, born and educated in France, helped as voicer and co-authored the reading materials. The University of Akron engaged Professor Robert Harris as Project Psychologist. Professor Edgar Mayer, University of Buffalo, served as an outside consultant to evaluate progress at the end of the first semester. Professor Frederick Eddy, Georgetown University, performed this same task at the end of the second semester.

IV. Description of the Revisions

Part I, Pronunciation

Part I has been completely rewritten. It now consists of 306 frames (328 including the intonation frames), amounting to a total of fifteen hours. This is a reduction of approximately twelve hours from the original ALLP Program.

The sequence of sounds in the revised Part I has been changed. It begins with the /i/ sound. The number of problems has been reduced by grouping the consonant sounds into larger categories. The table of contents for Part I, included in the appendix lists the new sequence.

Experimentation with a number of students in sound discrimination led Dr. Harris to the following observations:

1. In the original Program, the time pause allowed for the student's reaction was too long. The student reacted not to the stimulus but rather to what he thought he heard or to what he mouthed. The time element allowed the student to rationalize his reaction.

2. The confirmation through "bleep" which was used for the SD's contained many features that were applicable also to the S Deltas -- during the waiting period the student had a tendency to repeat the phonetic features. Thus his confirmation often applied to his own rendition of the sound and not to the original discrimination.

The Revised Program, therefore, contains new discrimination frames. The stimuli occur every three seconds, which was determined through a LaFayette timer during voicing. The confirmation is given through a voiced "yes" or "no" prior to the next stimulus. This technique reduces the time interval, allowing approximately one second for the student's reaction to the stimulus.

The vocalization frames differ from the original ALLP Program in two respects: 1. The stimuli do not contain any S Deltas. 2. The sequence consists of stimulus, pause, confirmation response. This sequence permits the student immediate comparison with his own utterance.

The frames entitled transformation do not ask the student to change utterances pronounced with an American accent into correct French utterances. The new transformation frames consist of contrastive drills within the language itself. They contrast the /i/ with the /e/ sound; the /ã/ (as in *banc*) with the /õ/ (as in *bon*) and the /ẽ/ (as in *bain*) (nasal sounds); the open and closed variants (*beau* vs. *bol*; *chez* vs. *cher*; *ceux* vs. *seul*); and the /s/ and /z/ sounds.

The syntax frames have been simplified by reducing the length of the utterances. In addition to the determiners, they stress the verb forms of the present tense, particularly the second-class verbs. They require the student to memorize the long and short stems.

Vocabulary frames have been added. They introduce lexical meaning of whole utterances, rather than of individual words. There are three types: repetition, English stimulus requiring a French response, and short dialogues. After testing, these frames were rearranged in the student booklet using a kind of vanishing technique to help the student memorize.

The number of phonemic transcription frames has been reduced by half from the original ALLP Program. The dash between the liaison sound and the word is eliminated so that the American syllabification habits will be minimized. The student is taught that a word beginning with a vowel sound may also begin with one of the following three consonants: *n*, *t*, and *z*.

Syllabification frames have been added. In the transcription frames of problems 1 - 5, no space has been allowed between words of the same utterances. Beginning with problem 6, the French syllabification habits are introduced and drilled consistently.

A number of frames (500 to 522) have been prepared for students who persist in the American stress and pitch features. They drill the most important pitch patterns of French. In an additional frame (453) attention is given to cognates.

Reading aloud is taught by means of fifty-two frames numbered 400-453 included in Part I. They teach the relationship between the sound and the graphemic symbols used in standard orthography but do not teach reading in the usual sense of reading for comprehension. The phonemic symbols used during the first section of Part I serve as the point of departure for the new associations. After testing, discrimination and vocalization frames were added where students had difficulty: the /ü/, /ö/, /o/, /u/ sounds, the nasal sounds, and the semi-vowel /ẅ/. Some frames were rewritten making greater use of contrast and review.

Testing and rerecording

Key frames of the revisions were tested with two subjects before carrying out the planned revisions. Revised Part I was then recorded by the Project Director and used during the academic year 1964-65. During trial use of Part I, the Project Director spent many hours listening to the student's performance and checking the number of work throughs on a random basis. Of course errors occurred during the learning process; however, they did not persist. An error analysis therefore would have been time consuming and would have yielded little useful information. This sentiment seems to be a reasonable assumption since the original Part I was reduced by more than half without adversely affecting the results. In general, students limited themselves to two trials per frame. After trial use a few minor revisions were made, such as deletion of an inappropriate word or utterance; mistakes were corrected. All frames were rerecorded in the spring of 1965 by Professors Claude Y. Meade and Theodore Mueller on a Magnecord 1021.

Part II, Vocabulary Learning

Part II was left essentially unchanged. It was reduced through the omission of twenty-three discrimination frames. It now consists of one hundred twenty-four frames numbered from 525 to 671 or about five hours of recorded materials.

Part III, Syntax

Major revisions were effected in Part III. One hundred forty-nine frames were omitted because the utterances were too long or needlessly complicated. One hundred eleven frames were replaced. The replacements occur primarily in the teaching of verbs, the goal being greater automaticity. A number of frames were added presenting an English stimulus and requiring a French response, all responses using the same pattern. They are designed to bring the contrast between the English and the French patterns into sharpest focus.

The explanations introducing each problem were rewritten and expanded. More emphasis was devoted to the contrast between English and French, and more detailed explanations were given.

The need for greater training in listening comprehension became evident in the first trial use of the original ALLP Program. To that end, the written French text and questions in most of the dialogues in Part III were withheld. In the beginning, the English equivalent is given, and later replaced by a short summary of the topic about which the voices speak. The written text is added as an appendix at the end of Part III in the student booklet. The forty-eight dialogues were reduced to thirty by eliminating those that were found to be of less interest to the students.

Spelling is presented in a separate section added to the explanations of each problem. The student's attention is drawn to the spelling problems through notes similar to the ones following the explanations of the spoken aspect. Approximately forty per cent of the frames are written out in the student booklet. Most of these frames also present the responses in writing. Each problem requires that the student write out a specified number of frames.

The one hundred eleven frames that were replaced were recorded by Professors Claude Y. Meade and Theodore Mueller. The revised frames were tested by monitoring the students. Since these revisions consisted of simplifications rather than new exercises, the expected results were obtained. These frames therefore did not need any further revisions. No changes were made in the remaining frames or dialogues.

Part III now consists of about 500 frames and thirty dialogues totalling about twenty-seven hours of recorded materials.

Reading for comprehension is taught through twenty reading passages that were added at various points throughout Part III. They were written in collaboration with Professor Claude Y. Meade. They deal with some of the major themes of French culture as seen from the anthropologist's viewpoint. They have been influenced to some extent by the research done in French culture by Professor Howard Nostrand and his associates at the University of Washington. The authors, both native Frenchmen, look at French culture from the outside and view it at times with tongue in cheek. They ask the reader not to take every statement at its face value, but to make allowance for l'Esprit Gaulois, this indefinable French trait.

The reading selections intend to enable the student to read the formal language for comprehension without verbatim translations into English. They teach the skill of reading in context, and thus increase passive vocabulary.

Questions have been added after each reading passage to draw the student's attention to the leading thought or thoughts and to serve as a guide for his paragraph-by-paragraph interpretation.

These comprehension exercises intend to lead the student to reading the formal language with ease. The latter (usually the literary language) differs somewhat from the spoken or informal language, which is the main objective of this French Program. Variety in structure, grammatical complexity and diversity in vocabulary - these are the main characteristics of the formal language. It is, therefore, the objective of these reading passages to lead the student gradually and slowly from the spoken language with its relative simplicity to the formal expression used in the written passages.

New vocabulary is first explained in a footnote. The new word is annotated in French if it is easily understood through a synonym or an expression leading the student to an easy general interpretation. Whenever the explanation in French would have been too cumbersome, or too vague, the English meaning is given in parentheses. The authors reject the principle of the direct method requiring all explanations to be done in the target language. This results, they feel, in an unnecessary wasting of time. A French explanation, however, was given whenever easily understandable by the student because the authors seek to induce the student to interpret from context, and not through translation.

Beginning with Chapter Eleven, a new section entitled Vocabulary Drill is introduced. While stressing verbs almost exclusively, these exercises are designed to help the student learn the vocabulary from context.

These passages were tested and rewritten incorporating the changes deemed necessary after experimentation. In the rewrite they were primarily simplified from the point of view of vocabulary and structure. They still are of a level of difficulty considered above first year reading materials. Yet in spite of their difficulty, they are successful with the students, who enjoy reading about French behavior.

A recording of the reading passages would have been desirable, but was not part of the proposal.

Part IV, Conversations

Part IV, consisting of twenty-two conversations, remained unchanged in so far as the tape content is concerned. The conversations total approximately three hours of recording. In the student booklet they were rearranged into three sections. The first section presents a free English translation of each conversation. In the second section exercises for vocabulary learning were added. In these exercises the student supplies key words in a sentence context, answers questions, and finally constructs a short dialogue based on English stimuli. The responses to these exercises are given on the reverse side of each page. The third section presents the French text of the conversation and the questions.

Student Booklet

The revisions that were finally made were so extensive that a completely new student booklet became necessary. The student booklet for the Revised French Program consists of approximately one thousand pages and is printed through multilithographic process.

In addition to the information given in each of the four parts of the Program, the student booklet includes: 1. a French-English vocabulary of non-cognate words, 2. a summary of grammar and verb tables for the regular and irregular verbs, 3. an index of grammatical subjects to permit reviewing weaknesses that the student discovers.

The original proposal suggested the inclusion of phonetic transcription of the lexicon items. After observing the students' performance in reading, such phonetic transcription no longer seemed necessary. Furthermore, the students did not make much use of the phonetic transcriptions that were used. The phonetic transcription system and the orthography of the language are a source of irritation to most students, who already have difficulty mastering one system. They feel that it tends to confuse them. In addition, good pronunciation habits were established and maintained throughout the Program. A recording of the reading passages would seem to be more fruitful and expedient.

For the same reasons, the phonemic transcription in the grammatical summary was left out.

Summary of the Revisions

The changes and additions alter Part I of the original Program and provide some major additions to Parts III and IV. One of the basic concepts according to which the original Program was constructed, namely the total separation of the various elements constituting the ability to speak (Tasks I through V) is affected. The distinctions between the original "tasks" are further reduced and a much more tightly organized program results from it. In the original proposal for the ALLP II Program in French, 1962, the term "spiral construction" was used to describe the grouping of the original tasks. In the Revised French Program, this concept is further expanded to include vocabulary with its lexical meaning in Part I and further reduces the distinction between the original "tasks." Reading is introduced at the end of Part I and is maintained throughout the rest of the Program. Writing is introduced at the end of each problem in Part III and maintained through the necessary exercises.

There are a number of apparent adjustments made to the student's preferences: explanations, earlier inclusion of lexical meaning, grammatical charts, and more formal testing. Such adjustments do not compromise the basic programming principles. They secure the student's cooperation and good will. The student's preconceived notions of language learning, which are deeply ingrained, cannot be changed overnight through a new learning concept.

Furthermore, some of the programming principles followed in the Revised French Program such as withholding explanations and lexical meaning for a major portion of the learning process, are still the subject of debate among several experts in the field. (See the work of Professor Stanley Sapon in his Spanish program.)

The Revised French Program has been reduced in length by about one-third and now consists of approximately fifty hours of recorded materials. It consists of the following:

1. Part I, 350 frames, 15 hours of recording, is divided into 20 problems, Reading Aloud, and Intonation Features. Each problem teaches a sound or the characteristic features of a group of sounds. Each problem consists of several sections: discrimination, vocalization, phonemic symbol, syntax, and vocabulary. The smallest working unit is called a frame and consists of a three-minute recording.

Part I is designed to teach native-like French pronunciation, that is, a pronunciation which approximates that of the native close enough that the speaker would be accepted by the French as a welcome outsider. It attempts to achieve reasonable accuracy with each French sound. The intonation features are taught so that the student habitually will follow the major features of French intonation such as rising and falling pitch where appropriate, particularly in a multiple-phrase utterance, phrasing, and those features concerned with the transition from one word to another, called linking and liaison. He is taught to avoid the specific English features, such as the characteristic English pitch slope, stress through loudness or pitch and English word boundaries. However, it does not include all the French intonation patterns as such.

Part I does not attempt to teach writing. The section entitled Syntax is not a systematic treatment of French grammar, but merely uses the sound under study in a select number of syntactical structures. It attempts to bring the student to the awareness that the syntax of a language consists of a number of sounds and combinations of sounds. Pronunciation remains the primary objective of Part I. The section entitled Vocabulary does not intend to teach all the vocabulary items used in this part or in the remaining parts of the Program. It presents only a few useful utterances to give the student the feeling that he is learning French and not just meaningless sounds.

The reading frames teach the sound-symbol association necessary for reading aloud.

2. Part II, 140 frames, 5 hours of recording, teaches a limited vocabulary. It presents some of the elements needed to learn the syntactical structures in Part III.

3. Part III, 500 frames, 27 hours of recording, teaches the basic structures needed to speak and understand the informal language. Each structure is introduced in its spoken form first, then it is presented in writing. It is contrasted with the relevant English structure to bring out points of conflict. The frames begin by making the oral forms automatic, and only in the latter part of the problem present written stimuli and responses for practice in writing. Furthermore, oral exercises in which the stimulus or response exceeds five or six syllables were found too difficult without visual support. Many students cannot remember and manipulate long utterances.

Supplemental exercises have been added consisting of English stimuli requiring French responses. They are not translations in the usual sense of the word, since all stimuli elicit the same pattern. These exercises bring the contrast between the native and target languages in sharpest contrast. Many students prefer to do these exercises first right after the grammatical explanations. They claim that these contrastive drills best bring the essential structural element to their awareness. The translation pattern drills also make the student aware of the structure in his native tongue. It has been observed that otherwise very intelligent students -- including adults -- do not recognize any difference between *I'm* and *I've*, between I am *smoking* and I am *poor*.

Part III also contains thirty dialogues. They are short everyday conversations which could be heard on the streets of any city. Of course, the very informal expressions and very informal style of the language have been omitted. These dialogues further expand the student's vocabulary. They also reflect a few of the cultural patterns characteristic of French society. The dialogues intend to lead the student from strictly controlled responses to free expression through models of conversation.

Twenty reading passages entitled *Le Français, cette étrange créature...* have been interspersed at various points during Part III. They introduce the student to reading for comprehension.

4. Part IV, 22 conversations, 3 hours of recording, is an extension of the dialogues of Part III. They fulfill the same purpose as the dialogues and are based on the same principles.

V. Procedures

Student Population

The Revised French Program was used at the University of Akron with a group of students in the Buchtel College of Liberal Arts and with a group of students in the night section.

The college originally planned to enroll half of the students in the day sections in the experimental program. However, at the time of registration, some resistance to being enrolled in an experimental section was met. It resulted in sixty-eight students being registered in the control sections and twenty-six in the experimental section. However, thirty-eight students were registered in the night section, which is an addition to the curriculum this year. Normally a first-year night section is offered only every two years. This experimental section was added even though a first-year section was taught last year. Thus sixty-four students began the French Program.

According to the Modern Language Aptitude Test (Carroll - Sapon) that was administered, the majority of the students in both the experimental and control sections ranked in the lower 50 percentile of aptitude as is shown in the following charts. (See the appendix for the table of aptitude.)

	Experimental	Control
75 - 99 percentile	20 per cent	19 per cent
50 - 74 percentile	23 per cent	19 per cent
25 - 49 percentile	28 per cent	43 per cent
0 - 24 percentile	28 per cent	19 per cent

Experimental:		Control:	
Mean	47.7	Mean	44.6
Median	45	Median	40
Mode	15	Mode	25

Compared to the student population enrolled in the first trial use, the present group would seem of inferior aptitude.

	1963-64	1964-65
99 - 50 percentile	62 per cent	43 per cent
45 - 5 percentile	36 per cent	56 per cent

Previous experience with learning French is usually no help in either experimental or control sections. These first year students usually have low language learning aptitude. High school instruction in French in general has been greatly improved, as can be seen from the percentage of students placed in advanced courses. All students are given a placement test which determines whether they will continue French in second or third year. As an incentive, credit hours without grade are given for previous high school training if the student succeeds in advanced courses. Therefore, those placed in Beginning French are students with either poor preparation or, more often, students with low aptitude.

Work Schedule

During the first semester the day section met for eight hours in the language laboratory and for one hour in class per week. The night section met for six hours in the language laboratory, unless the student took the tapes home, and for half an hour for class display session each week. A schedule of weekly assignments was given to each student for the fall semester and every effort was made to hold the student to it.

The first semester covered the first one thousand frames, that is, Parts I and II, and three hundred frames of Part III according to the following schedule:

Part I, frames 1 - 362	four weeks
Part I, frames 400 - 453	two weeks
Part II, frames 525 - 671	two weeks
Part III, frames 700 - 1000	six weeks
Total	fourteen weeks

During the second semester, students spent an average of three to four hours in the laboratory. The students in the night section spent one hour a week in class, while the day students met for two hours in class. In addition, it is estimated that they spent another four hours a week with home preparation. Most students in the night section took the tapes home. The remaining three hundred frames of Part III and Part IV were assigned for the first twelve weeks. The last three weeks were reserved to review as needed and to permit the slower students to finish their work.

Each student was given detailed instructions as to the nature of the course and extensive explanations about programmed learning. These explanations consist of excerpts from an article in Encyclopedia Britannica, 1964 edition, and an article from Time Magazine (March 24, 1961.)

A laboratory schedule and a class schedule were prepared for each student. Daily attendance was kept with an indication of how much had been achieved for each day. Each student was monitored every day by the attendants and occasionally by the instructor. The attendant kept a record showing whether or not the performance was acceptable. The attendant listened to the tests, noted the quality of the responses, and then reported his impressions to the instructor. If the attendant considered the student's performance to be questionable, he was asked to repeat the test for the instructor. Some students who demonstrated excellent discrimination ability were instructed to omit discrimination frames.

On the basis of the student's schedule, the total time spent in class, laboratory, and home preparation amounts to an average of ten hours a week or less for twenty-five weeks or a total of 250 hours. Students in the control sections spend an average of ten hours a week during thirty weeks, or a total of 300 hours. This total is computed from their estimate of time spent in home preparation indicated in personal conversations.

Class meetings, called display sessions, were arranged in small groups. At first, groups of four were established, but soon they gravitated towards larger groups of about seven to nine students. There was a certain reluctance to meet in groups which they considered too small.

The display sessions were conducted by the Project Director and occasionally by an undergraduate student majoring in French.

While Parts I and II were assigned, the weekly display session was used to demonstrate the student's mastery of pronunciation. Transformation frames, vocabulary frames, syntax frames and the frames for reading aloud were used in these meetings. Their purpose was as much to convince the students that they were learning and making progress as to check their actual control of speech. Few explanations were given and only when requested. However, much encouragement was needed by all participants who constantly wanted to be reassured that they were learning.

While Part III was assigned, the display sessions emphasized syntax through pattern drills, which could be turned into small conversations between two students. The stimulus by the instructor usually directed the first student to ask a question:

Stimulus: Demandez-lui s'il travaille.
Response 1: Est-ce que vous travaillez?
Response 2: Non, je ne travaille pas.
Mais je vais travailler.

Most structures could be used in this or a similar format. It is a pattern drill since all responses follow the identical pattern. It is also a type of conversation bringing students in social contact with each other and permitting the ambitious student to express an original idea occasionally. As the student gained more skill, a greater variety of structures was introduced through the stimulus.

Slides representing various French scenes of everyday life and correlated with the vocabulary they had learned were used very early in the Program. The stimulus was a question by the instructor:

Où va l'enfant?
Qu'est-ce que l'enfant apprend?, etc.

The response was found in the picture which served as stimulus to elicit vocabulary items.

Slides were also used as the basis of a lecture to give them practice in oral comprehension. Ten to twenty color slides concerning a topic often related to their reading passage were used for a fifteen to twenty minute presentation. During the lecture, the students were required to answer questions about the slides to determine whether or not they understood.

Slides proved to be an effective device to give the student the assurance that he was learning French. They demonstrated to him the extent to which he understood. He saw vocabulary and structure in meaningful relationship.

The reading passages were discussed for half an hour per week. The student had an opportunity to ask questions about what he failed to understand. He then was required to answer detailed questions about the reading passage. This question and answer period served as an oral comprehension exercise, and also as a demonstration to the instructor to what extent the student understood what he was reading. Occasionally ten to fifteen minutes were spent in English discussions about the cultural content of the passages. Students wanted further explanations of the "strange" behavior of the French.

The dialogues were the basis of questions addressed to the students. Toward the second half of the second semester the dialogues and conversations were used as the basis of conversations for groups of two students. One of the two participants in each group told the substance of the dialogue and was then questioned by the other. After that they impersonated the dialogue, either repeating closely the model sentences or more often adapting it at their fancy. The instructor supervised these groups correcting all errors he heard. If these conversations were not always correct, they made up for this in spirit and enthusiasm after the ice had been broken.

The display sessions served several purposes. They

1. established short-range goals through weekly assignments,
2. demonstrated how much was being learned and thus motivated the student,
3. established a familiar classroom atmosphere with its discipline and recitations,
4. served occasionally to shape certain patterns through response differentiation.

Tests were given in the laboratory. During Part I the tests included in the Program were administered. The student was asked to record his responses on tape for later analysis. During Parts III and IV written tests were designed to check their mastery of the grammatical structures. Each test consists of thirty to fifty items to be completed in thirty minutes. A grade of 80 per cent or better was required to be permitted to move on to the next assignment. The test could be taken over if it was unsatisfactory but only after having done the necessary review. The reading assignments were also tested through questions to which a one phrase answer was usually sufficient. It was so constructed as to avoid spotting part of the question in the reading text. It tested reading comprehension, which was the purpose of these passages.

The language laboratory was staffed by an informant, a young man, M. Luc de Lovinfosse, native of French-speaking Belgium. His duties had been defined as follows:

1. Providing the student with the necessary tapes and supervising the equipment on which they are used.
2. Checking the students' performance, that is, recording the appropriate test frames, monitoring the students' work while learning and advising them when necessary.
3. Testing the revised Part I: making an error analysis of all frames in Part I involving the work of three students chosen at random. Such an error analysis was to serve as the basis for the revisions to be made during the year. It was to provide information about mispronunciation of all vocalization and reading frames, structural mistakes in the syntax frames and vocabulary errors in the vocabulary frames.
4. Keep a record of observations about the students' learning.
5. As a foreigner with limited knowledge of English, he was to establish a little foreign island in the laboratory.
6. Give encouragement and directions where needed.

The underlying assumption was to find ways by which natives living in this country could be used in the capacity of informants in conjunction with this Program.

The young man who came to this country specifically for this purpose (and therefore could not be interviewed by the Project Director before his coming) proved to be incompetent to assume these responsibilities and showed little interest in his duties. He furthermore was unable to establish rapport with the students, who avoided talking to him as much as possible. His assignments, therefore, had to be changed. He administered the language laboratory, provided assistance with equipment when requested, administered and corrected the tests. Some students elected to practice reading aloud by having him listen to them read the reading selections.

Evaluations

At the end of the first semester, the experimental students were interviewed by Professor Edgar Mayer, University of Buffalo. His report is reproduced in the appendix.

At the end of the second semester, they were again interviewed by Professor Frederick Eddy, Georgetown University. His report is also found in the appendix.

Professor Robert Harris investigated the students' attitude in a survey which attempted to answer certain complaints about time involvement and requirement. His survey is printed in the appendix.

Dr. Harris also consulted with students in both the day and evening sections on an informal basis. He investigated their reactions to various areas affecting the learning process. These consultations were valuable for making revisions primarily in Part I. Further suggestions made too late to be incorporated in the revisions are part of the recommendations at the end of this report.

The results were evaluated through the MLA classroom test administered to all students at the end of the second semester. The Cooperative Listening Test was not administered as had been suggested in the proposal. The experience in the first trial use demonstrated clearly that this test, which preceded the MLA Cooperative Test by several years, was not applicable to the students in the Program. It tested vocabulary primarily and reflected the language analysis of traditional teaching. The vocabulary and structure are oriented toward literature rather than the spoken language.

VI. Observations and Suggestions

In addition to the conclusions reached on the basis of the results, a number of observations can be made about the Program, the implementation, and the students' attitude. These observations can serve as guidelines for eventual publication of the Program and improved implementation at the college level.

The Program

Part I was totally rewritten to shorten the learning time, and to improve certain aspects in speech which do not show in the tables illustrating the results that were achieved. The first objective, a shorter learning time devoted to the sounds of the language, was imperative since the student does not consider phonetic accuracy important, but rather a waste of his time. In spite of the reduction of the learning time, this feeling of futility persists among many students. It is a threat to the success of the Program since it is not conducive to establishing good study habits but rather induces a negative attitude or strengthens an existing negative attitude towards FL learning. This shortcoming can best be overcome in two areas:

1. by greater teacher participation and supervision over the learning process in the language laboratory. Every opportunity must be used to demonstrate the usefulness of accurate pronunciation in the syntax and vocabulary items.
2. by integrating the oral reading frames (400 - 453) at the end of each problem. After each sound has been mastered through the various exercises which constitute a given problem, it should be introduced in its orthographic symbolization. Such a sequence will reduce the aversive features (feeling of futility) characteristic of the phonemic symbols and reinforce the feeling of learning, if only learning to "read French," popularly considered an essential part of language learning.

In order to achieve a shorter learning time, careful supervision in the laboratory seems necessary. Some students waste time with the discrimination frames. They feel that even though they have made fewer than four errors, they still do not know the discrimination well enough, and continue reviewing it. This practice should be discouraged and the student should be told that discrimination training is only a means to an end, the objective being accurate pronunciation. An occasional student acquires an acceptable pronunciation and yet is unable to attain criterion score in the discrimination frames or does so only after an excessive amount of time spent with discrimination.

Improvement of certain other aspects in Part I was the second objective of rewriting Part I. After completion of Part I, the student was to have acquired automatic control over determiners and verb stems. This was accomplished through the new syntax frames and became quite evident when studying the appropriate problems in Part III. It again demonstrates that learning morphophonemic features is not necessarily tied to meaning.

Improvement in mastery of a number of sounds was also the objective of the revisions in Part I. However, perfect materials could not achieve perfect results as long as students care little about phonetic accuracy. A number of students were told to redo the vocalization frames of the nasals when the need for further drill became evident through the pertinent tests. This does not, however, seem to warrant the addition of more frames in this area, but rather emphasizes the need for careful checking of the work of those students who tend to become careless in their pronunciation. It is apparent that only a small number of students take the pains to listen to their performance objectively, that is, after having made the recording.

The question has been raised whether the more gifted students could follow a shorter path through Part I without impaired pronunciation. A number of students were permitted to omit the discrimination frames after they had demonstrated that they achieved criterion score at the first trial during the first three problems. The number of students was less than half of the experimental section. Since the Project Director's time was devoted to revising the Program, an undertaking that consumed much more time than had been anticipated, the question can be answered on an impressionistic basis only, for lack of well-controlled evidence. On that basis, it would seem that students who evidence superior ability will not suffer from the omission of the discrimination frames, particularly in view of the fact that the student is exposed to such an extensive amount of oral work. The question, however, should be carefully investigated under controlled conditions.

Essentially, Part I teaches the French phonology rather well. Improvements are primarily matters of detail.

Part II was shortened through eliminating a few frames. It now is the weakest link of the Program. Although it effectively teaches vocabulary, much of the vocabulary taught there is not useful, lacks effective context, and therefore fails to arouse interest. In the initial stages of writing the Program, the author was too concerned with counteracting the natural tendency of the learner to equate one word of the target language with one in the native language. The same purpose could well be achieved by asking the student to memorize short four-line conversations that would be interesting and give the appearance of being useful for conversation. Many of the techniques used in Part II would be helpful in making the response automatic and in memorizing.

Part III has been much improved by the elimination of needlessly difficult frames, the replacement of the initial frames in the tense drills, the addition of written exercises and the reading passages.

The written exercises, that is, the frames for which the stimulus and the response are printed, and which usually are to be answered in writing after having mastered the pattern, are of great help to the visual minded student, who has great difficulty remembering the oral utterances. This may be contrary to the principles of first mastering the oral then the written language; but it is in harmony with programming principles of proceeding from the easier to the more difficult, because such a student finds the oral language his most difficult task.

Part III could be further improved by a number of factors:

1. Closer integration of the subject materials used in the pattern drills, the dialogues, and the reading passages. The pattern drills consist of sentences out of context and with little meaning which are repeated endlessly. This was done on purpose to prevent meaning from interfering with the learning of the patterns or structures. The endless repetition of the same sentences was intended to concentrate the learner's attention and to make the pattern habitual. This, however, also contributes to the dullness of these frames. Instead of the sentences without context, the more interesting and above all amusing sentences from the dialogues and, later, from the reading passages could be used to the same end as described above. They would be meaningful to the student after having memorized them in the dialogues, and thus have context. If judiciously selected and limited, the original purpose of avoiding interference in pattern learning from vocabulary would be maintained.

2. Explanations of a cultural nature added to each dialogue in the form of a short introduction for reading would add to the meaningfulness of each dialogue. These dialogues usually illustrate some French behavior pattern or ideology different from that of the learner. In its present form it usually fails to communicate effectively the underlying cultural pattern. Such explanations would increase student interest.

The dialogues should also be exploited for their vocabulary content to remedy the apparent weakness in vocabulary on the part of the experimental students. Written vocabulary exercises similar to the ones used in the second part of the reading passages should be added.

3. Reading for comprehension needs to be rewritten and further expanded to about twenty-five passages. Vocabulary exercises similar to those used in the second half of the reading passages should also be added to the first ten passages.

4. The grammar presentation now in programmed form needs rewriting. Dr. Harris suggests that the programmed form is not necessary since the subject matter, if well stated, is not difficult. A succinct statement as a conclusion from a number of examples

could be followed by a few questions to assure comprehension. Such an approach has the advantage of greater familiarity to the student. Dr. Harris also suggests that, for most oral frames, between a quarter and a third of the exercise should be printed to help the visual minded learner.

Some students, again the visual learner primarily, object to the separation into speech and writing of each structure. They are unable to realize the divergence between the spoken and the written language. They want a single visual representation, the orthographic script being the most useful for their purposes. The dual presentation has an element of confusion for them, so much more so since they already have a tendency to look down on the oral aspect of the language. To them the dichotomy between speech and writing must be constantly emphasized. It must be demonstrated to them that, of all people, they need this dual representation most.

Review sections are often requested by various observers and by some students. Review is built into almost every frame throughout Part III; however, it is not obvious to the casual observer. Review is not conceived of in this Program as a body of grammatical material for which the student can formulate rules. Review is aimed at the student's language behavior. He may not be able to state structural phenomena, but it is felt that the use of correct structures is the all-important factor.

Part IV has been improved by the addition of further exercises. Emphasis on oral learning of these conversations must be maintained to avoid the proliferation of exercises in writing. The English translation is needed as the initial contact with each conversation. It establishes the context necessary for comprehension. Too many vocabulary items and expressions are introduced at once to permit initial comprehension without this help.

In general, the evolution of the Program is evident in the creation of four distinct and unrelated portions:

a. the materials used to teach pronunciation
b. the materials used to teach morphology
c. the dialogues and conversations
d. the readings for comprehension

The underlying principles first had to be developed and tested.

A final revision should now integrate all elements. In the materials used to teach pronunciation the vocabulary items should be used which occur later in the other parts. In the material teaching the morphology the sentences should reflect the content of the dialogues and readings of previously learned elements. These sentences will replace the more or less meaningless sentences now used. However, this is not to be interpreted that, as in the usual texts, there will be a dialogue and a reading lesson for a chapter, then exercises using the content of these items. This would violate the carefully established principles of programming.

Implementation

Students strongly expressed themselves in favor of the display sessions, which they considered classes. They attributed to them a large share of their learning in contrast to the language laboratory, which they considered unproductive. They had to be shown again and again that their class performance would not have been possible unless they had had extensive laboratory work before.

Display sessions in groups of three or four were less favored than six to eight students or more. To them, a small group is not a class where they can compare their performance with a group of classmates. Furthermore, in a small group they must perform constantly and orally.

Testing at regular intervals played a prominent role in the success of the Program. Each test served as an intermediate goal and gave them a weekly grade which, to our students, is of prime importance. It serves as a milestone in which they place all their faith for the semester grade. Testing also acted as a sort of discipline which helped the students to accomplish a given amount of work in a given period of time.

In each problem of Part III, an oral frame and a writing frame should be designated as testing frames. In self-instruction, the student should replay the tape and compare his answers with those of the confirmation answers. If he made fewer than four errors, his work is satisfactory. If he works in the language laboratory the monitor should listen to the student's responses, make note of the errors, and advise him about what he needs to review if necessary. The student should consider this writing test frame as an examination. He should write out the answers and compare his responses with the model. A criterion score of no more than two or three errors should be considered satisfactory performance. The final publication of the Program should implement this suggestion. The written tests administered at fifty frame intervals should be retained as review tests on which the class grade is based. The present tests given in Parts I and II are sufficient to insure proper progress.

A precise schedule outlining the learning task week by week, and a laboratory schedule for each student also proved to be a wholesome disciplinary influence. It spelled out what was expected of each student week by week. Many students, unfortunately, work only under pressure and would forget about their foreign language for weeks if their attendance in lab and class were not demanded.

Greater emphasis should be placed on the dialogues and conversations during the display sessions. The dialogues and conversations should be memorized. In the present trial use, the impression is left that the student skimmed through them as quickly as possible. The tests emphasized mastery of structure above all else. This was, therefore, what the student prepared, often omitting the dialogues. Since most students take French as a requirement and do not intend to use it later, nothing will be interesting enough to motivate them for an effort if it is not made the object of a test. Memorizing, furthermore, is the most difficult task for our student generation, most of whom have never memorized a line in any language beyond their prayers.

For these reasons additional tests must be devised that require verbatim rendition of the entire or at least portions of the dialogues. The pattern drills used during the display sessions likewise should make use primarily of these dialogues and also include appropriate materials from the reading passages.

Two students in the evening class relied on the technique of memorizing with spectacular results. Although both rated as fifteen percentile on the Modern Language Aptitude Test (Carrol - Sapon) and never had French before, they achieved results in the 80 - 99 percentiles on all four skills. In the case of one, the team evaluating their performance in speaking on the Modern Language Cooperative test refused to believe that she could be a first year student. They insisted that if perhaps not native, she certainly must have had much previous experience in French. Their judgment was based on the two free speeches for which the test uses pictures as stimuli. She presented two speeches consisting of appropriate sentences from the various dialogues and conversations, which she knew by heart.

Greater emphasis on vocabulary learning and accuracy of interpretation should be given to the reading passages. The author's primary concern in reading was to teach reading from context and he neglected to insist on the final step in this approach, an accurate knowledge and memorizing of essential vocabulary. This resulted in a superficial attitude towards comprehension whereby the student deluded himself into thinking he understood when he had only a vague idea of the meaning of the paragraph. This weakness again can probably be remedied through better tests requiring more specific answers, using the new vocabulary in the question and requiring its use in the response. Permitting the student to use the text while taking the test was probably a mistake and resulted in inferior preparation. Unfortunately, the nature of the test often determines the amount of the student's preparation.

Forty per cent of the day students who began the Program dropped out for various reasons. Here are some reflections and suggestions resulting from observing these particular students.

It is commonly assumed that a good program will solve all learning problems in any given subject. Allegedly, if the program is well constructed no student should have any difficulty learning. On the other hand, if some students do not learn, the program must be at fault and should be changed.

Such an assumption is contrary to the experience of some foreign language programmers. A ten minute session three times a week devoted to response shaping or response differentiation with students who have demonstrated that they do not learn in a traditional classroom situation nor through a program produces the results expected from the program. A program not controlled by a teaching machine can be misused by the learner. An oral program, at the present stage of the art, does not permit objective evaluation and confirmation of the student's response by a mechanical source but relies on the learner's hasty self-evaluation. An important facet of programmed learning is, therefore, missing and affects reinforcement.

The present Revised French Program has produced outstanding results in all four language skills and achieves the terminal behavior it claims to have as its goal primarily with certain types of students. The well-motivated student who wants to learn the language for some utilitarian purpose, such as a trip to France, achieves these results in a remarkably short period of time. Furthermore, the well-organized student who knows how to learn and to concentrate also achieves exceptional results. But he does so in all of his subjects whether taught by a program or not. The average student who comes regularly and does not need much extrinsic motivation also achieves good results.

There is, however, one group of students which do not fit into the above mentioned categories. They are enrolled in the FL class because it is a requirement like so many others in their curriculum. They receive their motivation for learning from many outside factors which have been developed in the usual classroom learning situations. Another group of students, whom Pimsleur classified as underachievers in a foreign language, have difficulty primarily with the oral aspects of a foreign language. They cannot process auditory signals.

As a result, the students in these two groups tend to drift, that is, they attend the laboratory irregularly, miss the display sessions for the slightest excuse, try to cut corners in working through the Program. Eventually they fall behind in their assignment and drop out. If they remain in class they require an inordinate amount of time and attention from the instructor.

The problem of implementing the French Program is thus complicated by the need of the human element in the classroom and by the learning habits of the students.

The human element of the traditional classroom is a potent motivation for the average student. When the atmosphere of the usual classroom is removed, much of the rationale for studying is missing. This phenomenon became evident to the investigator years ago when the television screen replaced the teacher, even though the instructor was present in the class.

The traditional class, meeting three or four times a week, spaces the work for the student into small segments assigned from one meeting to the next. It acts as a disciplinary force to which the student submits out of habit. The class and its members also act as a form of social approval. Each student holds a rank which he tries to maintain. The daily recitations reassure him that his position is secure and will eventually be rewarded by the appropriate grade at semester's end. There are other pleasant rewards, such as the joking in the foreign language which he can understand, the instructor's questions and explanations, etc. All these things reassure him and act as reinforcements.

When the class meetings are removed these extrinsic reinforcements are also removed, and with them much of the learning motivation. Instead he is isolated in the booth of a language laboratory for the greatest portion of his learning. The length of time spent alone with the tape recorder is particularly objectionable to many, for whom the intrinsic reinforcement of work accomplished is not effective. These students find no satisfaction in being able to correct themselves or in completing successfully a given amount of work.

In the opinion of some students, the weekly display sessions in small groups do not stress what has been learned in the drills. They see little relation between answering a personal question about what he ate and the drill on the past tense.

Other students mentioned above as visual learners have particular difficulty with an audio-lingual program. Although they are good students in other subjects, their difficulty can be traced to a lack of sound to symbol relationship. These students learn primarily through the visual modality. An audio-lingual program with primary stress on the oral skills catches them at their greatest weakness.

Visual learners do not profit from the oral confirmation answers in an audio-lingual program. They are groping when their erroneous response is corrected from tape. They are unaware that the model is different from their own response. However, they are unable to determine in what respect their answer differed and are unaware of the essential element of a given structure. For this reason they get discouraged. The small display session requiring oral performance is particularly distasteful to this group because of their difficulty in relating sound to symbol. Stressing their particular weakness in the oral skills makes every session aversive.

The inability of the student to correct himself effectively, that is, his inability to select and compare the essential sound in a sound sequence is much more widespread than has been assumed in the past in spite of the great stress which the French Program placed on discrimination training. This deficiency is not limited to the group of students who have difficulty in relating sound and symbol. Even among students who succeed well with the Program, persistence in an error over a number of frames has been observed. Although the error eventually disappeared, it is evidence of the trial and error procedure followed by the learner and his inability to profit from the self-correcting features built into the Program. If the student is aware of some undetermined discrepancy between his response and the model it contributes to his discouragement. It certainly is an essential factor in how much time the student spends in learning.

For these reasons, two or three weekly meetings with no more than fifteen students are recommended.

Class meetings with their desirable features can solve some of the problems under study. The desiderata of the traditional class such as the discipline of daily pacing, competition, social stimulation and extrinsic reinforcements will fulfill the needs of the first group of students discussed in this evaluation. The needs of the second group of students can be met through response differentiation, also called response shaping, which so far has not been applied in programmed learning. The technique of response differentiation is feasible in the laboratory without exceedingly expensive teaching machines, which do the listening and comparing for the learner, and reinforce only the correct response.

Response shaping should be one of the principal functions if not the most important one of the class meeting. Through special techniques still to be developed the instructor would shape the responses of the individual student, particularly the one who has great difficulty with an audio-lingual course. In essence response shaping consists of making evident to the student the essential element or elements to which and with which he must respond, inducing him to make correct responses in confirming each correct response.

Although response differentiation is a technique particularly intended for the small group of learners having difficulty with an audio-lingual program, it will prove beneficial for all participants. It will reduce the learning time for each individual when he works alone with his tape recorder.

A class structure as described above will not reduce teaching costs if staffed by the departmental staff, a problem posited for further investigation in the original proposal. It is advocated here that under proper supervision of a senior staff member, teaching interns could be used to great advantage as was demonstrated by the occasional use of an undergraduate major at the University of Akron.

It has been strongly recommended by an MLA committee headed by Professor McAllister that the teaching of beginning language courses be entrusted to experienced language teachers and not to graduate students engaged in their doctoral work. Such a counsel is wise indeed in the traditional teaching situation where learning occurs in class and from a book. In the French Program "teaching" is no longer in the hands of the instructor but accomplished through the Program. The functions of the instructor using the Program have been changed to exerting discipline, checking the work done and rewarding the students' diligence, functions which can well be fulfilled by the consciencious graduate student. Shaping as discussed above may be left to the skilled instructor or perhaps the supervising staff member as long as a corpus of particular techniques does not exist.

It is not suggested that class meetings as described above will solve all learning problems. Among the drop-outs there are many students who refuse to submit to the learning discipline exerted by the Program. If the response is oral they wait long enough until it is given. If it is written they look it up, with the conviction that even though they did not formulate the response, it is exactly what they meant. They do everything to avoid putting forth the mental effort needed in learning. They may thus spend hours of so-called study with no results. They refuse to concentrate on the task at hand and welcome every distraction. One student illustrates the point. After weeks of applying all techniques described above in private meetings with him three times a week, it became evident to the Project Director that he did little work in the laboratory and even failed to attend regularly. His excuse: "You are teaching me."

A teaching machine which prevents the student from tampering with the learning mode, which exerts total control over the student, and which, by preference, checks the written responses for him as to accuracy, seems the only solution left if such students are to learn a foreign language. It is questionable whether the effort and expense is worth while, since the same students are likely to revert to their previous habits when they continue in the intermediate course.

The present Revised French Program, though, could be used with a teaching machine by transcribing it onto the proper format.

The amount of material to be covered was another problem suggested for further study. One student without previous French completed most of it in a three month period, from September to December. She and her family went to France at Christmastime for a year's residence there. Another student with two years of high school French completed the Program in one semester as a review, and then continued in the second semester of the intermediate course. All other students with or without previous French took two semesters as scheduled. If done conscientiously a great amount of material is to be learned and requires from two hundred to three hundred hours of work.

A program is to be self instructional, that is, a program should provide the student with all the information and practice needed to master the learning task without explanations or further guidance from an instructor. If understood in this restricted sense of the word "self-instructional," the Revised French Program can be considered auto-didactic and can be used by students of varying levels of maturity. Presently an eleven-year-old girl is working through the Program with excellent results. She is now working through Part III without any help except a weekly conference to demonstrate what she has accomplished.

The word "self-instructional," however, is often understood in the sense that no teacher and no class are needed. The learning habits of our college population are such that the usual trappings of a class are needed as explained above. A language, furthermore, is a means of communicating with other individuals. If the communication aspect is removed there is no "raison d'être" for language and no incentive for language learning. A possible but unlikely trip to France in the distant future does not motivate the learner of any age.

The problem of discouragement was to be studied further. Compared with the previous trial use, it has been greatly reduced but it has not been eliminated and it may not be possible to solve this problem completely as long as a very high degree of perfection is demanded. Several students, both in the day and night sections, found the demands either beyond their ability or -- in the view of the Project Director -- were not willing to give it the time needed. They preferred to change their majors to avoid the language requirement. The reaction of two students is interesting. Although they made an A in the course and performed to full satisfaction, they declared that they were not going to continue since it required more time than they were willing to give.

Both Professors Mayer and Eddy reported a very favorable attitude among the students they interviewed, as is evident from their reports. They substantiate the impression that a great improvement of attitude towards programmed learning characterizes the Revised French Program.

The student's biggest complaint, however, remains time requirement of the Program. Professor Harris, Psycnologist, was asked to investigate the problem. In his report (found in the appendix), he points out that although they admit not spending more time than the students in the control section, the time factor is related to boredom in the laboratory. Isolation and concentration under the control of a machine are the aversive factors needing to be alleviated. Several suggestions might help reduce these aversive features:

a. An ungraded test or tests within each problem of Part III to demonstrate to the student how much he has achieved and perhaps instructing the student to omit certain frames if he successfully passed the test. "Successfully" would have to be defined in each particular case.

b. Insertion of frames for listening purpose only, easy enough to need no repetition by the average learner, demonstrating again achievement in that particular problem.

Although the author has no specific inclination to have the students like the Program, he recognizes the fact that a negative attitude will affect the learning process adversely.

Adults tend to underestimate their performance and to get discouraged. They compare themselves with the model and realize their hesitations and shortcomings. The lack of class comparison and of instructor approval cause such feelings of inferiority.

The Program itself gives the impression of being very demanding, probably because of its emphasis on the oral skills, which many students instinctively consider unattainable. Adults furthermore don't limit themselves to what they have learned to say, but rather expect to be able to express what they want to say.

The self-instructional nature is another reason why some students consider the Program to be a difficult method by which to learn. They are convinced that it is much more difficult to learn if the instructor does not "teach" them and they must learn by themselves. This sentiment was expressed by a number of students and other adults.

Implementation of the Revised French Program, 1965-66 at the University of Akron

The Revised French Program will be used at the University of Akron with one section of Beginning French during 1965-66.

Schedule:

First semester:

Part I, frames 1 - 363	first four weeks
Part I, frames 400 - 453	next two weeks
Part II, frames 525 - 671	next two weeks
Part III, frames 700 - 1039	the remainder of the first semester, approximately fifty frames per week

Second semester:

Part III, frames 1000 - 1362	ten weeks, averaging thirty-five frames per week
Part IV	three weeks

N. B. The remainder of the semester is scheduled for review.

During Part I and II the student will be scheduled for eight hours in the lab per week, three of which will be as a group supervised by the instructor. Each of these three lab sessions will be introduced by a ten-minute display session of what has been learned. Shaping techniques will be tried in an effort to influence the students' attitude favorably.

During Part III - IV, the assigned laboratory time will be reduced to four hours, one of which will be supervised by the instructor. In addition the students will spend two hours in class, and an estimated four hours in home preparation.

Display sessions will be used as already described. They will be used to divide the work in small assignments, to check student performance, to display his skill in conversation, and to establish the learning set most conducive for their work in the lab. Slides will be used as an exercise in oral comprehension and to elicit responses. Portions of the tests used during 1964-65 will be administered again in the laboratory when the student feels ready for them. Additional tests will be used to test the dialogues and the reading passages.

The passages for reading comprehension will be recorded by several voices. It will help students with comprehension, and serve as a model for pronunciation of the new vocabulary items.

A major examination will be administered in class at the end of the sixth and twelfth week of each semester. Major examinations are familiar and essential to the student. They establish his rank in class, and in his own opinion are responsible for his grade. Staying in class or dropping out is often determined by these examinations. For these reasons they will be used, although they have no other value, nor are they needed for the purposes alleged by the students. However, they will help to reduce drop outs through back sliding or non-attendance.

Much greater emphasis will be placed on memory work from the very beginning. The student will be expected to memorize the dialogues and conversations, memory work which will be tested at regular intervals during the entire year. Likewise the vocabulary of the reading assignments will have to be memorized within the sentences in which it occurs. The student will be instructed to make himself flash cards with the vocabulary item on one side of the card and the sentence in which it was used on the reverse side. Flash cards will serve as memory aids similar to the memory drum used in psychology.

A major effort will be directed at reducing drop outs. Potential drop outs can probably be identified early in the course by checking the student's past record and the early examinations in Part II, and by watching his record of attendance. Any student who is suspected as a potential drop out will receive more personal attention from the instructor. In the laboratory his work will be monitored by an attendant. He will have to demonstrate every day how much he has learned. A proposal to the University of Akron's committee on research will be submitted soliciting the necessary funds to further investigate this problem.

Adjustment of the Program for Gifted Students

In the original Program, the question was raised concerning a shorter Program for gifted students. High aptitude students are likely to acquire new language habits with fewer repetitions than the average or low aptitude students. These students are more quickly bored by many repetitions and therefore are not likely to put forth all the effort of which they are capable. They could benefit from a shorter Program with fewer pattern drills. Final publication of the Program should indicate what portions of certain frames could be omitted by such students.

Another method of determining when the student has acquired mastery of the materials to be learned in a frame would consist of directing the student to omit the second half of certain frames if they have not made more than one error in the first half. The half mark of the frame would be indicated on tape through a tone signal. Not all frames would lend themselves to this treatment. Some frames progress from a short utterance to a longer sentence. The gifted student would need to go through the entire process to acquire the memory span for handling such longer utterances. Omitting portions of a frame is particularly applicable to the pronunciation drills in Part I.

Branching is a third device which however seems to require complex machinery not normally available in a language laboratory.

The Project Director feels, however, that the reductions thus accomplished for the gifted student would only be modest, eliminating twenty per cent or less of the entire Program. Even a gifted student needs a certain amount of drill in order to acquire the new language habits.

In the dialogues and in Part IV, any reduction would not seem advisable. The gifted student will save time because he will require fewer trials than the less gifted student.

VII. Results

A. Results of the Experimental Group

The MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Test, 1963, was administered to all experimental and control students at the conclusion of the academic year. This test consists of four parts testing listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing.

The results in listening comprehension and reading are of an objective nature and were corrected by student assistants with the help of the appropriate keys. Half of the writing test is of an objective nature. The other half requires some form of composing, either sentences or a complete dialogue. A key and scoring points are furnished as guidelines for the correction of each sentence. Scoring is controlled so that the subjective element is reduced to a minimum.

A student majoring in French corrected all writing tests. In addition, a second student majoring in French corrected the composition to establish reliability for that portion which requires most subjective judgment. In this manner, all students in both control and experimental sections received equal treatment, permitting objective comparison of the results.

In the speaking part of the examination, several elements are tested: mastery of the phonetic and intonation features in free speech, mastery of the phonetic features in reading aloud from a printed text, fluency, mastery of vocabulary and structures. The scoring sheet assigns specific values to the various elements. Thus again subjectivity on the part of the scorers is reduced to a minimum. The speaking test was corrected by two staff members, Professors Meade and Pulleyn, who evaluated each student individually. Neither of them having taught a first year section, they therefore did not know who the students were and should be considered objective evaluators. Their scores were then averaged.

National norms have been established for this test and published in the Booklet of Norms. They list raw scores, converted scores, percentile bands and mid-percentile ranks. For purposes of analysis in this study, the mid-percentile ranks are used.

The raw scores, converted scores, and the mid-percentile ranks for each student are listed in the appendix.

The results thus obtained in the four skills serve as a basis of analysis of the effectiveness of the Program.

Twenty-seven students in the experimental section finished the course and served as the subjects for this analysis. Thirty-one students completed the course in the control sections. The following discussion will deal first with the results obtained in the experimental section and only later make the comparison with the control sections.

Table 1

MLT PERCENTILE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL CLASS

	Listen	Speak	Read	Write
Day students	64.7	87.0	45.3	53.9
Night students	59.3	82.6	56.0	58.8
Combined	62.5	85.2	49.7	55.9

Discussion

The comparison of performance between the day students and night students is of interest. In the oral skills, the day students were superior over the night students, with a statistically significant difference for speaking. In the written skills the night students were superior over the day students, with a statistically significant difference in reading. The superior performance of the day students in speaking reflects the increased contact in class, where the day students spent two hours a week while the night students spent only one hour. This seems to lend further support to the need for class meetings with the instructor where the spoken language is used and practiced as a means of communication.

The superiority of the night students in the written skills is more difficult to explain. Being older students they seem to rely more on the written language and to prepare the reading and writing assignments more thoroughly, especially since a tape recorder is less accessible to them than to the day students. The level of maturity of the night students might well be another factor that influenced the reading scores of these people, who were older and professional people with previous college training.

The linguistic aptitude of the student population is a factor deserving consideration in the evaluation of the results. Compared to the student population in 1963-64, the students in the experimental section were decidedly inferior. (See table on p. 13.) Yet the results of the present experimental group are on the average much improved. This is attributable to the revisions made in the Program as well as to the way in which the Program was administered.

A number of observations can be made about each skill and are presented in the following paragraphs:

1. Speaking. The average percentile of 85.2 demonstrates excellent performance of the experimental students, half of whom scored in the 90 percentiles. Of course this reflects the audio-lingual nature, the primary emphasis of the Program. The excellence in speaking is corroborated by both outside evaluators, Drs. Mayer and Eddy. Professor Mayer praises their achievement as "strikingly good. The range of achievement between the best and the worst is narrow. The weakest student would certainly rate B in a conventional audio-lingual course." (For the complete report, see the appendix.)

Professor Eddy's 1964 report was an enthusiastic endorsement of the students' ability to speak. His report on the results of 1965 likewise praises highly their performance in speech. Commenting about their pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary, and comprehension, he says, "In general, they show improved performance, in spite of the fact that the 1965 interviews were given four weeks earlier than in 1964, well before the end of the course, and before there had been much practice in free conversation." In his impressions about the reading, he says, "In general the student's native-language phonology has been largely replaced by something approximating French phonology, and the native English does not become dominant even under the heavy pull of reading from a printed page. In some cases the effect is very French."

These results are gratifying, particularly in view of the fact that the time devoted to pronunciation was reduced by half compared to the original Program. Although discrimination was drastically reduced in the Revised Program, this had no ill effect on the results in pronunciation.

The most glaring mispronunciations occurred in reading, where the student tended to pronounce graphemic signals which are not normally pronounced, such as the s added to indicate plural of a noun. This is probably due to the introduction of reading at the end of Part I, a time when new pronunciation habits are not yet very firmly established. This observation, however, does not warrant placing the reading at a later point. This problem would be most easily remedied through the creation of tapes accompanying the reading selections in Part III. This tendency also was more prevalent among students who had had French in high school than among those who had never had French before.

2. Listening Comprehension and Writing. The scores in listening comprehension (62.5) and writing (55.9) demonstrate relatively good performance compared to the national norms. In both of these areas the original Program showed definite deficiencies in the 1963-64 trial use. From the above results, it can be

concluded that these deficiencies have been effectively remedied.

Due to the large amount of oral listening to which the students in the experimental sections are exposed throughout the Program, it could be expected that results similar to those on the speaking test should be achieved. The reasons why this is not the case can be attributed to the test itself. The test favors the formal language and the formal vocabulary which is standard with most textbooks. The Program, however, stresses primarily the informal language and a vocabulary geared to what a traveler is likely to hear in France.

The results in listening comprehension of the original Program (1963-64) revealed a weakness in listening skill with discourse involving vocabulary unknown to the student. The Revised Program successfully remedied that inadequacy by withholding the text of the dialogues and asking the students to make an honest effort to understand before turning to the written text.

The Revised Program also successfully remedied the weaknesses in writing by adding many writing drills.

3. Reading. The average scores of 56.0 for night students and 45.3 for day students in reading reflects average competence measured against the national norms. These results are somewhat surprising since the reading selections prepared for the revised version were of a degree of difficulty exceeding standard reading texts in first year French. Professor Eddy's evaluation did not note any such weakness in reading comprehension. On the contrary, his tables of the results indicate a B average for comprehension.

The mistakes made by the experimental students in the reading test were analyzed and compared with those made by the control students. This comparison indicates that the apparent weakness occurred in the first twenty-five questions, which constitute nothing more than a vocabulary test. It again reflects a vocabulary selection greatly different from the informal vocabulary taught in the Program. The fact that the performance on reading proved to be only average is therefore attributable to the test. A finding which lends support to this conclusion is the observation that second year French students who had studied by the programmed method during their first year and had obtained average percentile ratings on the reading test at the conclusion of the first year attained the high level of performance shown by all classes at the end of their second year's study.

The differences in performance between the night students and the day students may reflect another factor besides maturity and life experience, as mentioned above. For the night students, the reading skill was more important in their basic language concept. They also spent more time with the reading and its vocabulary since these materials were more readily available to them than the oral materials. The implementation of the Program, therefore, should place greater stress on reading and its vocabulary than has been done with the day students.

B. Comparison of Experimental and Control MLT Results

The day section of the experimental group in the following analysis is compared with the control group (also day students). The night students are excluded since they compose a markedly different student population with different problems and difficulties.

A comparison of the results of the Program students and those in the control sections is confounded by the fact that a high percentage of control students had dropped out. Therefore, only the more successful students are represented in the control MLT results. In order to partially equate the experimental and control groups, the results quoted here do not include four experimental students who at one time or another asked to drop the course but were persuaded to stay.

Table 2 compares the mean results of the experimental students with the control students:

Table 2

Mean Percentile Scores on Final MLT 1964-65 - 1st year

	Listen	Speak	Read	Write
Control	74	81	71	59
Experimental	69.4	90.5	51.6	63.0

Table 2 shows the results obtained from the control and experimental groups on the MLT administered at the completion of the first year of study. The differences between the groups on the four subtests and their levels of significance are as follows: Listening - no difference; Reading - Control is superior to Experimental (P less than .05); Speaking - Experimental is superior to Control (P less than .05); Writing - Experimental is superior to Control (P less than .05).

Second Year Results

The original proposal suggested investigating how the students after having completed the first year French through the original Program were performing in their second year French course taught in a traditional manner.

During the summer of 1964, three students completed the second year in a six-week course offered at the University of Akron. One of them completed his third year French in the academic year 1964-65 and has elected French as his major. Twenty-four enrolled in various sections of the second year French course during the academic year 1964-65; sixteen of them enrolled in the honors section of the course. Eighteen of these twenty-four students completed the course.

The second year French course is divided into one honors section and several other sections. Admission to the honors section is by permission of the instructor if the student has taken first year French at the University of Akron or by attaining a score of 200 which represents the sum of scaled scores on the Cooperative Placement Test. The honors section differs from the other sections in that greater emphasis is placed on the spoken language.and the reading program is expanded.

The program of the second year consists of the following materials: Le Petit Prince by Saint-Exupéry (Honors Section only) and Contes de l'Inattendu, edited by Parker (Heath) are used for intensive reading. Both texts are accompanied by a pattern drill booklet requiring written answers for further drill in writing. The grammar review is based on Mulhauser-Desberg, Le Français d'Aujourd'hui (Ginn). Camus' L'Etranger; La France et les Français by Brodin, Ernst (Holt, Rinehart, Winston); Pagnol's Topaze; and Daudet's Lettres de Mon Moulin (Honors Section only) are used as extensive reading.

Table 3

Mean Percentile Scores on Final MLT 1964-65 - 2nd Year

	Listen	Speak	Read	Write
Control	74.2	73.0	61.2	63.6
Experimental	69.2	77.6	62.4	49.6

Table 3 shows the results obtained from the second year MLT for the control group for two years and the experimental group which had completed the second year French under a traditional system. Only in speaking, where the experimental group still demonstrates its superiority and in writing, where the control group performs more capably, are statistically significant differences (P less than .05) found in the scores of the two groups.

These results indicate that even when differences exist in the performances of students taught by each of the methods, these differences are readily eliminated following further work in a traditionally taught French course. The performance by the experimental group on the second year reading test most explicitly demonstrates this point.

It can be concluded on the basis of the two year results that little differences are obtained in the performances of students who are taught French by either a programmed or a traditional format, except differences in speaking.

The above conclusions are further substantiated by Professor Eddy's report (see appendix), in which he made the following comments about his observation of the second year class.

"The discussion, entirely in French, centered around a tale by Daudet. A little over half of the group had done their first year with the ALLP in 1963-64. I could detect no difference between their handling of the material and the language and the performance of those prepared for this course in other ways. This corresponds with Dr. Mueller's impressions, and apparently means that in the acid test, preparing for good second year work, the ALLP compares favorably with solid high-school preparation or a good first year college French course."

Every innovator would like to be able to report that his experimental students showed better results on standard tests. This, however, is unrealistic in view of the excellence of the students who completed their studies in the control sections. Compared with the results on a national basis the results obtained in the control section at the University of Akron are outstanding. It would be very difficult to surpass a 70 percentile class average.

C. Structural Analysis of Free Speech and Writing

Other comparisons were made that are not evident through statistical comparison of test results. It was assumed that the students in the experimental section should demonstrate a greater mastery of the basic grammatical patterns and a greater variety of patterns in speech, since the Program stressed the spoken language primarily. The speeches based on the two picture series that were part of the MLA test were therefore transcribed to permit a grammatical content analysis. The transcription was made by an assistant who did not know which students were in the experimental group. The grammatical content analysis was done by another assistant majoring in French. The following categories were established: passé composé, futur, conditionel, imparfait, negative structures, infinitive structures, que clauses with subjunctive, que clauses with indicative, other subordinate clauses, direct object pronouns, indirect objects. Every correct use of one of these grammatical structures was listed and given a numerical value of one point. A similar grammatical content analysis was also made of the written dialogues the students were supposed to compose at the end of their writing test. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

	Mean speaking	Mean writing
Experimental	7.0	2.9
Control	2.2	2.7

Table 4 presents scores of experimental and control groups on the language analysis test. The experimental group scored higher on the speaking scale than did the control group ($7.0 > 2.2$; P less than .05); relative scores on the writing scale ($2.9 > 2.7$) are not statistically different.

The significantly higher speaking scores on the structural analysis for the experimental group are in agreement with their higher MLT speaking scores. The MLT speaking test tests the student's accuracy in pronunciation, his fluency in oral reading, and his ability to communicate. The structural language analysis reported above measures only the communicative skill, in particular, the ability to use and manipulate the structural signaling system which is essential for communication. The lexical items, which form the second element needed for communication, are completely disregarded. Therefore, this seems to be a very sensitive index of language mastery. In the final analysis the ultimate goal of language teaching consists of imparting the ability to use the varied syntactical structures automatically in a variety of contexts. Robot-like parroting of a language is a familiar criticism of the audio-lingual teaching method. The critics point out that the student can only use the patterns he has memorized in context or dialogues that have been memorized. The same criticism is raised against the programming method, a point which, it might be noted, is not accepted by those experienced in the method. On the contrary, it is the objective of a language program to provide a learner with the basic language patterns which he will need in order to communicate in many different situations.

The above table demonstrates that the experimental students have acquired a superior ability in the use of the basic language patterns in speech if not in writing. They can express themselves with greater variety and accuracy than those in the control sections. This is not surprising since automaticity of the French structures was one of the prime objectives of the Program.

The fact that the experimental students are not able to transpose their automatic mastery of structure into writing indicates that they need much more opportunity to write if communication in writing is a primary objective, which was not the case in the French Program.

D. Correlation between Aptitude and Results

In traditional French courses, a positive correlation usually is found between a student's aptitude and his final results. This is evident also in the control sections as seen in the following table:

Table 5

Mean Percentile Scores Correlated with Aptitude

Aptitude Percentile	Listen	Speak	Read	Write
99 - 70	75.5	83.6	78.7	65
65 - 40	73.6	82	67.8	49.5
35 - 10	65	68.8	54.8	53

No such correlation between aptitude and results can be established for the experimental students as is demonstrated in the following table:

Table 6

Mean Percentile Scores Correlated with Aptitude

Aptitude Percentile	Listen	Speak	Read	Write
99 - 70	53	82	46	53
65 - 40	59	83	38	42
35 - 10	67	85	57	56

Students with the lowest aptitude seem to have had acceptable or excellent results. The following table compares the low aptitude and the results of the individual students:

Table 7

Aptitude Percentile	Listen	Speak	Read	Write
15	42	84	50	87
15	69	94	63	81
15	87	99	78	100
15	80	99	32	81
20	27	76	50	46
20	56	57	63	67
25	60	73	43	10
30	84	98	68	67
30	96	97	81	93
35	71	73	43	33
MEAN	67.2	85	57.1	66.5

These results are of particular interest since only three out of the ten low aptitude students had prior experience with French.

This leads to the following conclusions:

1. As has been found with other courses taught by the programmed method, the influence of individual differences in student aptitude are minimized. The chances of performing adequately are good for low aptitude students in a programmed language course.

2. Since in the control section the majority of the low aptitude students either dropped out or achieved only acceptable results, and in view of the fact that half of them had prior experience with French, it seems that the programming features of the course are the decisive elements to which the success of the low aptitude student can be attributed.

Therefore, it would follow that every effort should be made to keep these students in the course, since the probabilities are good that they will profit from continued attendance.

It is interesting to note that almost all low aptitude students perform rather well on the speaking test. Contrary to what would be expected, low language aptitude students do not have inferior pronunciation or ability to communicate. It seems that this aspect of the language is effectively taken care of in the present Revised Program. While specialized equipment may help these students to achieve their excellence in a shorter amount of time, it is not likely that speaking is discouraging them more than the other students. Low aptitude students have difficulty primarily with learning the structure and the vocabulary. They are slow in memorizing. Teaching machines now in existence are presumed to be very effective in remedying this difficulty.

3. Of the twenty-two low aptitude students originally enrolled in the course, ten, or almost half, completed their work, while in the control sections, only twenty per cent of the low aptitude students finished.

4. The low aptitude students who dropped could probably have been helped if all the programming features could have been brought to bear upon them. Low aptitude students do not receive reward from the confirmation features of the present Revised Program. They therefore need the teaching machine which gives them a visual indication every time that their response was correct. They also need the control of the machine to prevent them from cheating. These students tend to look up the correct answer before making the mental effort required in formulating the response, convincing themselves that this was what they had in mind anyway. These same students often do not know how to use their time efficiently and can waste enormous amounts of time. The machine can also control this element and thus make learning less time consuming.

The question of why the high aptitude students did not achieve significantly superior results over those achieved by the low aptitude students in the experimental section remains unanswered. It is a known fact that in other courses where programming is used aptitude and results have very low correlation. It is possible that these students are bored with the programming method and thus do not perform up to potential. The following suggestion deserves attention in future experimental use. If the display sessions were grouped homogeneously and if the high aptitude display sections received greater emphasis on dialogues, conversations, readings, and such matters that challenge their interest, perhaps they could be induced to greater efforts.

It is not possible to establish any correlation between student aptitude and drop outs in the experimental section. Students with high aptitude dropped out of the course just as frequently as those with middle or low aptitude, as can be seen from Table 1 in the appendix.

It is interesting to note that whatever correlation had been found in the original ALLP between MLAT and the results no longer is valid with the Revised Program. No doubt the more efficient implementation of the Program and closer control of student weekly performance had some bearing on this reversal. In future use of the Program, a more effective administration and placement of students in homogeneous groups may result in better achievement among the middle and high aptitude groups once they are made to work to their fullest capabilities.

E. Drop-out Study

In a drop out study it is felt that the students in night sections must be left out, since they are not comparable to those in the day sections. Some of them are not working for their degree but take a foreign language for various reasons such as personal interest, business, etc. Often family conditions cause an interruption in their study. In other cases their business plans change: they are sent out of town to a different job, causing interruption in their studies. Or they simply no longer have any need and decide not to continue. For these reasons, the drop-out study is based only on the day students.

Table 8

Drop Outs

	Enrolled	Finished	Per cent
Control	74	31	41.8
Experimental	27	16	59.2

Table 8 shows that a significantly greater (P less than .05) percentage of experimental as compared with control students completed the first year course.

The academic records of the drop-out students in both sections were examined and it was discovered that of the eleven experimental students who dropped, seven had dropped over half of their courses during the semester, while of the forty-four control students who dropped, the great majority dropped only the French course. These figures would indicate that the programmed method itself is responsible for the fact that so few first year students dropped the French course.

A drop-out rate of fifty per cent has been normal in the control section for a number of years at the University of Akron. Reasons why almost 60 per cent did not complete the course are difficult to establish. It may well be that the aptitude of the students that enrolled was inferior to previous years. A steady decline in student aptitude has been noticed during the last two or three years. Better foreign language teaching in high school prepares students to enroll in our second and third year courses. which have been greatly enlarged. Therefore, many of the students who enroll in the first year either have not taken any foreign language in high school, often because of lack of aptitude, or if they have taken it did not succeed well enough to place in advanced courses. These arguments, however, are largely conjectural and are based on personal feelings of the staff. As has been demonstrated before, the aptitude of these students was statistically inferior to those of the previous year.

The fact that only 40 per cent of the original enrollment of the experimental section did not complete the course is attributable to the programming features. It has already been noted before under the study of aptitude correlation that the low aptitude students have a very good chance of succeeding if they stay with the Program.

Compared to the 1963-64 trial use, the number of students who did not complete the course in 1965 has increased from 32 per cent to 40 per cent. However, it will be noted that among the students of 1963-64 several students had not finished the course at the end of the academic year. In the 1964-65 trial use, those students who did not keep pace with the group were advised to drop the course by the middle of the second semester. The 59 per cent who did complete the course finished their work within the two semesters allotted for the course. This explains the increase in drop outs.

The fact that only 40 per cent did not complete the course compared to the 58 per cent in the control sections is even much more significant if the emphasis on the oral performance in the experimental course is kept in mind. The afore-mentioned Mueller-Leutenegger study on drop outs demonstrates that the emphasis on the oral aspects of the language drives many students away from the course. In the ALLP Program, more than half of the work must be done without visual help from the student booklet.

Table 9

Comparison between 1st Year Enrollment and Second Year Completers

	Enrolled 1st Yr. 1963 and Summer 1964	Finished 1st Yr. 1964	Per cent
Control	40	18	45
Experimental	42	28	66

Table 9
(Cont.)

	Enrolled 2nd Yr. 1964	Finished 2nd Yr. 1965	Per cent
Control	13	12	92
Experimental	24	18	75

	Percentage of 1st Yr. Enrollment
Control	30
Experimental	42

Table 9 presents the number of students and percentage of those who, having enrolled in the first year course in 1963, completed their second year course in 1965. The percentage of students completing the first year experimental course (66 per cent) was significantly greater (P less than .05) than the percentage who completed the first year control course. The Registrar's records show that a large number of students in the control sections did not re-enroll in the second semester of the first year. Another drop-off occurred in the enrollment of second year control students. Of the original total of forty students enrolled in control sections of French, twelve continued through to completion of the second year for a percentage of 30. Of the original forty-two students enrolled in the experimental section of French, eighteen continued through to completion of the second year for a percentage of forty-two.

On the basis of these results, it is apparent that French taught through a program retains a much greater proportion of its students than does the traditional classroom procedure. Perhaps the most significant comparison to be drawn from these figures is that of the percentages of students in the two groups who completed the second year of French. In view of the two-year language requirement which all Liberal Arts students have to satisfy, a student should be considered a drop out if he does not enroll in second year, even if he successfully completed the first year work. The 42 per cent figure recorded by the experimental group indicates that they were sufficiently satisfied with and confident of their French language proficiency to continue into the second year. The drop-off that occurred in the control group between the original enrollment and second year finishers does not speak well for this method in imbuing the students with the attitude necessary to continue in the course.

VIII. General Acceptance

The students' attitude towards the Program is reported by Professor Mayer and Professor Eddy and was thoroughly investigated by Professor Harris. Professor Mayer reports that he found student attitude to be "uniformly excellent. Students expressed only praise for the method." Professor Eddy made a more thorough survey and had the students register their approval or disapproval on a rating scale. His findings corroborated Professor Mayer's impressions. In comparing student attitude toward the Revised Program with their attitude toward the original Program in 1963-64, Professor Eddy writes, "This year students gave fewer qualified answers, i.e., showed more unanimous and sure approval of the course, and fewer negative opinions of it."

Professor Harris attempted to evaluate student acceptance of the Program as objectively as possible. He found that the most frequent complaint concerned time involvement. Yet both experimental and control students were spending exactly the same amount of time working on French -- approximately ten hours per week.

Twenty students enrolled in programmed sections, and twenty in the traditional introductory French courses were administered an attitude survey designed to evaluate their reactionto learning French by means of materials other than text books and class room discussion. The students were chosen at random from the enrollment in first year French.

All subjects were evaluated on: 1. a new media scale, 2. an attitude toward speech scale, 3. an ease of learning scale, and 4. an achievement scale. The only results which were statistically significant were those obtained from the achievement scale, in favor of the experimental students. They showed greater conviction that they were learning French from the programmed tapes when compared with the control students' sense of achievement in the language laboratory.

At the end of the attitude survey, students in both groups were asked two open-end answer questions: a. What in the teaching of this course do you like the most? b. What in the teaching of this course do you dislike most? A content analysis was made of the answers to these questions.

From the content analysis, two categories appeared to be sufficiently inclusive for most of the statements made by the subjects: a personal category and a technique category. The personal category consists of statements relating to the teacher's role, the learner's interest in the language and the people, and his ability to converse in French. The control group favorably mentioned this category more frequently than the group in programmed learning. When the experimental subjects discussed interpersonal motivation factors their comments were directed toward the lack of extensive interaction between instructor and students.

The technique category consists of statements relating to students' study methods, their time involvement, their command of the language and difficulty with the material. In eighty per cent of the cases the experimental students commented favorably on this aspect of the course.

In the questionnaire data, the experimental students showed a favorable attitude toward the study methods of the Program; however, they also claimed that they were bored.

Dr. Harris concluded that the basic causes of this boredom were prolonged solitary confinement, which was intensified by the physical arrangement of this particular laboratory, and the intense concentration demands of programmed materials. The students were enthusiastic when speaking about specific aspects of learning French, but their overall impression about the course was influenced primarily by their feelings of aversion toward the language laboratory. Because of this feeling, they magnified the time demands in their own minds. (For complete report, see the appendix.)

While it may be important to the effective teaching of a subject matter that the student be favorably predisposed to the format presented him, it is well established that the learner generally is poorly qualified to judge the effectiveness of an instructional technique. It is one thing to accede to a student's "morale" needs by utilizing displays, anecdotes, and other interest gambits; but it is quite another to modify the teaching format in any real way simply for the purpose of making the student like it more. In our student attitude surveys, we have concentrated on the reactions of the students to various facets of programming and have suggested means by which unfavorable attitudes might be mollified. It should be emphasized, however, that changes in the technique based simply on negative student reactions would be very unsound, to say the least.

There are other probably more important indices by which to evaluate the effectiveness of the programming technique. These are the drop-out rates and the student performance records discussed earlier as well as a still more important index, that of continuation in French through the required two years.

IX. Conclusions

Trial use of the Revised ALLP French Program during the academic year 1964-65 proved to be very successful on the college level. Although reliance on self-instruction has been reduced and a greater role assigned to the instructor, it promises eventually to accommodate large classes at the elementary level of language instruction without affecting the excellence of the results. It promises using staff time with greater efficiency and thus reducing instructional costs.

Under proper guidance, programmed foreign language instruction will permit graduate students engaged in their degree program to be used in elementary language instruction. In a recent document the Modern Language Association took the position that graduate students should not be assigned to the first year foreign language course. It expressed the view that elementary language learning requires the expert guidance of the master teacher. Since the ALLP Revised French Program is taking over the teaching aspects that were the main burden of the instructor, it is hoped that graduate students will be just as successful with this Program as the experienced teacher has been. Guidance will always be necessary, of course, but such guidance can now be provided in manual form for the graduate student.

Continued experimentation with eleven-year-old students on a very small scale seems to confirm the earlier hope that the Program will find application in high school.

The second trial use suggests the following observations:

1. The ALLP Revised French Program maintained a reduced rate of student drop outs. Of those that dropped from the programmed course, the majority had dropped half or more of their other courses, while the great majority of the control students who dropped out dropped only French.

2. The drop-out rate of the low aptitude students in the experimental sections is significantly lower than in the control sections.

3. All low aptitude students who completed the course achieved good or excellent results although it required more effort on their part. This is significant and can be attributed to the Program.

4. A significantly larger percentage of experimental students continued and completed the required second year course than control students. This is perhaps one of the most significant results of the French Program.

5. All native American students including those with low aptitude achieved high speaking performance. Their speech characteristics approximate those stated in the objectives, namely, near-native pronunciation. However, many students with prior experience with high school French maintained certain speech habits acquired in high school and were characterized by a slight American accent.

6. The results obtained in first year French by the experimental students are in all respects equal to those of the control students. In speaking ability, they surpassed the control students as expected because of the nature of the Program.

7. Although statistically the performance in reading was inferior, it is asserted that this inferiority is deceptive. It is attributable to the nature of the vocabulary in the MLA test.

8. In addition to the scores obtained on the MLA test, the mastery of grammatical structures among the experimental students was much superior to that of the control sections, both in variety and accuracy.

9. Greater automaticity in speaking was observed in the speeches by the experimental students compared to those of the control students.

10. The results of the experimental students in the second year of French are equal to those in the control sections in every respect. The inferior performance that was noted at the end of their first year has been fully corrected. Most of these students were placed in the honors section and competed very successfully with the best second year students in the reading and writing skills as well as the oral skills.

11. Overwhelming acceptance of the Program was found by all outside consultants. The students feel that they are learning and that they have achieved a satisfactory level of competency.

12. Boredom, which is commonly reported with programmed instruction is still apparent but is attributable to the physical features of this particular language laboratory, the isolation in the student booth, and to learning under the control of a machine. This aspect of programmed learning however was effectively counterbalanced by the activities in the display sessions. Further modifications of the implementation in the language laboratory can probably still reduce this particular feeling.

13. No relationship between the student's linguistic aptitude and the results could be found. Furthermore, the student's aptitude had little or no bearing on dropping out of the course, that is, an equal percentage dropped out from the high aptitude as from the low aptitude range.

14. The Revised French Program requires from 250 - 300 hours of work in class and individually for the average student. Some gifted and well-motivated students are able to do it in much less time.

15. The revisions in Part I did not affect the results in pronunciation. The great reduction in discrimination training is of particular interest. The addition of vocabulary learning and of reading in Part I did not adversely affect their pronunciation either.

16. The revisions in Part III created greater automaticity of the verbal structures as had been intended. The addition of reading selections and the expansion of the writing exercises produced the desired improvement in the reading and writing skills.

Whether or not a self-instructional language program is feasible is answered positively in this study. However, a number of concessions to the communication aspect of language had to be made. Self-instruction cannot be interpreted as a learning situation between a student and his material alone. Some means must be provided whereby the student can use the language in its role of oral communication with another speaker of the language. Further research should be directed to the role of such a "conversationalist."

The question of the efficacy of an audio-lingual program in which the student is conditioned to evaluate the accuracy of his own oral responses and thus to receive confirmation by means of comparing his responses with the model is worth investigating. The results obtained in the oral skills certainly warrant an affirmative answer. Regardless of student aptitude, speaking was uniformly excellent. However, in spite of the results, observation of the learning process gives ample evidence that greater external control over student oral production, by preference by a machine, is highly desirable. On the one hand, conditioning the student to the phonetic features is highly successful. On the other hand, much needless trial and error learning occurs in Part III, where the student is called upon to evaluate longer utterances. Self confirmation of syntactical elements which initially had been deemed easier than phonetic evaluation is more difficult than assumed. It may require for some students additional frames in which they are conditioned through discrimination frames as to which structure is correct and which is not. Further research in this area is desirable to see whether discrimination frames for syntax can eliminate much of the groping evident in a number of students.

Teaching machines controlling the written responses are likely to prove valuable for those students for whom foreign language learning is particularly difficult and time consuming. Although the percentage of such students is small, they are often students who are very successful in other fields of learning. Any effort in their behalf seems worth while.

Evaluation of the Mueller ALLP Program in French
(Results at end of first semester)

by Dr. Edgar Mayer
(State University of New York at Buffalo)

This evaluation is based on the performance of Dr. Mueller's night students whom I interviewed ; I heard the performance of his day students on tape. I was able to hear each student of the night section as he took his final oral examination and then to chat briefly with each in French and then in English.

Achievement after covering roughly one thousand frames is uniformly strikingly good. The range of achievement between the best and the worst is narrow: the weakest students would certainly rate B in a conventional audio-lingual course.

Pronunciation is very acceptable, with only minor lapses ; few students have an accent that one could call specifically American, and that only on occasion. There is some interference from spelling: some "mute e's" come out as é or è , Marseille was pronounced [marsyé] or [marsel] by one or two students, and so on. But by and large the performance was superior.

Structure (morphology and syntax) too showed some weaknesses, all of them predictable: j'ai prendu, je n'ai fini pas, je suis étudié le français and once in awhile an overcompensation: je n'ai pas visité de France. But again I must insist that performance was superior to what we normally hope for at a comparable stage of a good audio-lingual course, and the weakest would rate a B.

Comprehension is difficult to judge. In the oral examination, faulty comprehension showed up either when the student answered inappropriately or when he did not answer at all. Neither occurred frequently. However, in the brief oral interview with me three or four of the students were unable to understand a question which involved the same kinds of material they had previously heard on the examination or worked on in their course. I suspect this is due to their never having heard my own voice before.

A fourth area which is a major concern of mine is what might be called "application to real life". By this I mean not exactly "free conversation", but the ability of the student to speak about, or particularly to answer questions about, the same topics he has been studying -- not exactly to respond in a set way, as in a pattern practice, and not just to answer questions about something he has heard or read but divorced from his own life. Admittedly it is asking a great deal to expect good performance in this area at the stage these students have reached, and in fact they were only fair at this. However, I should point out that most of them were quite capable of telling me, for example, whether they had ever studied French before starting the Mueller program, or what other languages they knew.

Student attitde is uniformly excellent. Students expressed only praise for the "method", and there was no evidence of boredom with the program. Boredom has been a sore point in my own programming of Russian. Centrifugal programming, such as Dr. Mueller has done, with structure and lexical meaning involved at almost every stage, seems to be the only way to insure that interest will stay at a high level. I am very much encouraged that this is so.

Suggestions. 1. Student ability to comprehend would doubtless be improved if they could hear a variaty of voicers on their tapes. I would hope that this need not wait until the program is perfected. 2. Greater ability in the realm of "application to life" could be attained by the insertion at strategic points of frames requiring the student to answer according to his own circumstances and by using part of the class time for this. I am well aware that the bulk of such work belongs in the later stages of the course, but I believe that some improvement is in order in the earlier stages as well.

In conclusion, it is my opinion that the program at hand is already attaining far better results than any other I know of, and that Dr. Mueller has made break-throughs at several crucial points. I am enthusiastic and delighted.

Report of Individual Examinations and Class Observation
(Results at end of second semester)

by Dr. Frederick Eddy
(Georgetown University)

Introduction:

On April 20 and 21, 1965 I interviewed the students in both the night section and the day section of First Year French at the University of Akron. They were receiving their instruction through the Revised ALLP French Program, revised during 1964-65 by Dr. Theodore Mueller.

On May 14, 1964, almost one year before that, I had interviewed ... a similar group of students who had completed their work in First Year French using the original ALLP French Program. (See my report dated May 14, 1964.)

The present report follows the same format as the one just referred to, but with important variations and additions that will become apparent in each part. This report also compares the 1965 group of students with those of 1964 in an attempt to evaluate the changes made in the Program.

In 1964, each student was interviewed for about twelve minutes ; in 1965, for about fifteen minutes.

I. The 1965 Interview in French: A. First Half

In the first half of the 1965 interview the same kinds of questions and the identical grading scale were used as in 1964. The results for 1965 are given in Table 1.

A typical interview had in it these kinds of questions from me.

Vous habitez Akron?
Combien de personnes y a-t-il dans votre famille?
Votre frère le plus âgé (grand), quel âge a-t-il?
Comment arrivez-vous à l'université tous les jours ; vous venez en voiture (automobile)?
Qui conduit la voiture?
C'est votre deuxième année à lúniversité?
Quelle est votre spécialité?
C'est aujourd'hui jeudi, n'est-ce pas? Et c'était hier mercredi. Dites-moi ce que vous avez fait hier, mercredi.
Qu'est-ce que vous allez faire ce weekend (cet été)?

At the end of the interview in French, I told the student to ask me questions: 'Maintenant vous allez me poser des questions, personnelles, professionnelles, tout ce que vous voulez'.

The student's questions were usually like the following, and in gènaral represented the best over-all performance of the group:

Comment vous appelez-vous?
Vous êtes professeur? A quelle université?
Où habitez-vous?

Immediately following each interview, I graded the student in five categories: Pronunciation, Fluency, Control of grammar, Control of vocabulary, Comprehension of my questions and remarks.

No difference was made in the oral examination or in the grading according to how much of the material of the course the student had covered. Thus all of the students who are behind the main body of the class should have rather low grades.

The grading procedure used was as follows. My rating was based on the performance to be reasonably expected from a college student after one academic year in a well-taught class meeting three hours a week supported by five half-hour lab sessions a week To be more specific, I had in mind a college or university -- like The University of Akron --where most of the students are not highly motivated toward the study of foreign languages. The rating would have resulted in somewhat lower grades if I had compared the Akron students with end-of-first-year students in such centers as the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service or Institute of Languages and Linguistics. The latter are highly self-selected even before applying to us ; we do a further screening of applicants: all have foreign-language mastery for communication either as their principal career goal or as a very high-priority tool. It should be noted, however, that among the students examined at Akron, I found a few who, having taken this course, were interested in going on to a French major, or to teaching French.

Grading Scale

A - exellent (so very good that a native speaker would not be inconvenienced or distracted, easy, fluent communication)

B - good

C - fair

D - poor

F - failing (communication badly impaired or lacking)

The rating of Pronunciation can be interpreted more precisely as follows. (The phrase "deviation from phonemes" means" deviation from near-native control of both suprasegmental and segmental phonemes." The phrase "mismanagement of allophones" means " mismanagement of allophonic detail, which is normally the source of a "foreign accent" in otherwise fluent speakers.)

A - Very few deviations from phonemes, and very little mismanagement of allophones. (Note that no student was rated A in pronunciation in 1964, and only one in 1965.)

B - Occasional deviations from phonemes and mismanagement of allophones.

C - Frequent deviations from phonemes and mismanagement of allophones.

D - Very frequent deviations from phonemes and mismanagement of allophones

F - Gross deviations from phonemes and mismanagement of allophones, or silence.

The rating of Control of Grammar can be interpreted more precisely as follows. ("Control of grammar" means control of those basic structure points normally taught in a first-year college course as described just above, including, for verbs, the use of present, past, and future tense.)

A - Accurate and complete control (Note that no student was rated A in grammar in 1964, two had A in 1965.)

B - Control above average

C - Control average in scope and accuracy

D - Control below average in scope and accuracy

F - Very incomplete and-or very inaccurate control

B. Second Half

In the second half of the 1965 interview in French I asked each student to perform two operations in the Texts Prepared for Reading Comprehension, Part III, Revised French Program by Professors Mueller and Meade.

The first operation concerned the reading selections numbered I through IX from which the students at this time of year are separated by a considerable lapse of time. Each student was assigned at random one of these selections. He was told to read silently the first three or four paragraphs, depending on the length of the paragraphs, and for this he was given approximately two minutes. At the end of the two minutes he was asked to give me a summary of what he had read in French. I helped most of the students through this summary with an occasional question, but on the whole I asked very few questions.

The second operation concerned the reading selections numbered

X through XVI, fairly recently studied by the students and therefore presumably reasonably familiar to them. Again each student was assigned one of these units at random, but instead of letting him read it I simply asked him a series of questions about it. Following the second half of the interview I summed up my impressions of the student's performance on both of these operations in a series of grades corresponding to those given for the first half of the interview. The results of this grading will be found in Table 2.

II. The Interview in English

In the last minute or two with each student in 1964, I got and summarized in writing his response to this question:

"A friend of yours is taking French next year. How would you rate this course, for him, as compared with the standard course in beginning French given on this campus? Please select one of the following." (I recorded his selection by number in the column headed "opinion")

1. very high
2. high
3. not sure
4. low
5. very low

Some students gave two ratings of the course, e.g., one for prospective majors in French, one for non-majors.

Next to each rating I summarized the subject's comment in answer to my last question, "Please explain your rating in a few words."

The 1965 interview in English was carried on exactly as it was in 1964. The results will be found in Table 3.

A glance at the numbered opinions given shows an improvement over last year. This year's students gave fewer qualified answers, i.e., showed more unanimous [illegible] approval of the course, and fewer negative opinions of it (numbers 4 and 5).

In Table 4 there is an array of numbered opinions given for 1964 and 1965, showing that the median in each year was number 1.

III. Comments on the Interview in French: First Part

A. Procedure

To the best of my ability, in 1964 and 1965 I gave the same kind of exam to all students, and rated them all on the same absolute scale. Thus, for whatever they are worth, all ratings are comparable, i.e., comparing one student's performance with another's or comparing a given student's control of vocabulary, for example, [illegible] of grammar or his pronunciation.

B. Effect on the Students

This year it seemed to me that the students were one the whole much more at ease than last year. None was very nervous or scared, and only in occasional instances was I obliged to rate a performance at the general level of D or F.

C. Results in 1964 and 1965 Compared

In Tables 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 there are arrays of grades given for 1964 and 1965 performances, showing the median in each case for Pronunciation, Fluency, Grammar, Vocabulary, and Comprehension. In general, they show improved performance, in spite of the fact that the 1965 interviews were given four weeks earlier than in 1964, well before the end of the course, and before there had been much practice in free conversation. Tabulation of the medians shows the improvement from 1964 to 1965 Part 1, the only grades that are comparable. (It must be remembered, however, that these are all subjective grades.)

MEDIAN GRADES COMPARED

Table	Student Performance in:	1964	1965 Part 1	1965 Part 2
5	Pronunciation	C+	B	C+
6	Fluency	C+	B-	C+
7	Grammar	C	C+	C
8	Vocabulary	C+	B-	C+
9	Comprehension	B	B	B

IV. Personal Impressions

It was obvious to me that the materials and their effect on the students have been improved.

Very probably one source of improvement in student performance is the regular schedule of two small-class meetings each week with the instructor. The students were obviously more at ease talking with me than they were last year -- almost certainly because they had practiced talking people.

The reduction of time on sound discrimination has apparently had no negative effect on achievement in pronunciation -- in fact the contrary is indicated in Table 5.

The Texts for Reading Comprehension represent a great step forward, in both enriched content of the course and positive effect on student interest.

Pronunciation difficulties noticed were:

1. Interference from spelling, especially the final plural s.

2. Interference from English intonation and other suprasegmental features. This accounts for the very small number of A grades in pronunciation.

Grammatical difficulties noticed were:

1. Inability to sense a shift from present to past or future tense as it occurred in a conversation.

2. Lack of morphological accuracy of all kinds (in verbs, nouns, adjectives). It may be that a more structured awareness of these changes, i.e., a systematic description of both spoken and written French, would help to obviate this difficulty.

V. Recommendations for Improvement

It seems to me that the improvements made in the past year, and those projected, are all good. I would simply encourage Professor Mueller and his associates to continue in the way they are going.

In particular, it seems highly desirable to use for drill material items introduced in the reading passages -- both to reinforce those items and to make more interesting drills.

And to the work on pronunciation I would like to see added the shaping of intonation and rhythm, if no other suprasegmental features.

It seems to me that every beginning adolescent or adult student of a language must be constantly helped -- even forced -- to build in his own mind a set of "boxes": simple, functional sets of contrasts and correlations, the reality of which he has fully experienced, and the operation of which is essential to using the language efficiently. Example of a simple spoken French-English contrast: "In English the noun-plural signal is usually heard after the noun (book - books) ; in French, before the noun (le livre - les livres)." I use this example to show that certain French-English sets of boxes, as well as many French-French, help the student visualize the structure of what he is doing thus nailing down the habit in a way that mere practice can never do.

VI. Observation of a scond-year class

On April 21 I spent part of a class period observing a lively and satisfying recitation in second-year French, conducted by Dr. Mueller. The discussion, entirely in French, centered around a tale by Daudet. A little over half of the group had done their first year with the ALLP in 1963-64. I could detect no difference between their handling of the material and the language and the performance of those prepared for this course in other ways.

This corresponds with Dr. Mueller's impressions, and apparently means that in the acid test, preparing for good second-year work, the ALLP compares favorably with solid high-shool preparation or a good first-year college French course.

VII. Taped Reading Test

Early in May 1965, fourteen students (day section only) recorded the same French reading test (dialogue and narrative) as the one used in 1964. I have just listened again to the 1964 tape, and played the 1965 tape through.

There is little to add to the 1964 report (which please reread for details). In general the student's native-language phonology has been largely replaced by something approximating French phonology, and the native English does not become dominant even under the heavy pull of reading from a printed page. In some cases the effect is very French.

This is not to say that the reading is on the whole of high quality. There are numerous spelling pronunciations, deviations from phonemes, mismanagement of allophonic detail. The suprasegmentals need as much work as the segmentals.

But the total effect is encouraging, presenting clear evidence that French speech habits are on the way to becoming second nature in the students using this Program.

Table 1

	PRONUNCIATION	FLUENCY	GRAMMAR	VOCABULARY	COMPREHENSION
1.	C-	D	D	D	D
2.	B+	B	B	B-	B+
3.	B	B+	B-	B	A-
4.	C+	B-	C+	B-	B+
5.	D	C	D+	C-	B
6.	D	C	D	D	B
7.	B+	C+	C-	C+	B+
8.	B	B	C+	B-	B+
9.	C+	C-	D+	D	D+
10.	B	B+	B	B+	A-
11.	B-	C+	C	C+	B-
12.	B	B	B	B+	A-
13.	C+	D-	D-	D-	D-
14.	B+	B	B	B	B+
15.	B	D	C	D	D
16.	C	C-	D-	D	C-
17.	C+	D	D+	D	C
18.	C-	D-	F	F	D+
19.	B+	B	B+	A	A
20.	B	B+	B+	B+	B
21.	B	B	B	B-	B
22.	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-
23.	B	B-	B+	B	C-
24.	B	D+	C+	D+	D+
25.	B+	A-	A-	A-	A-

Table 2

	READING Sum Up (I-IX)	SELECTION Q.A. (X-XVI)	PRONUN.	FLUENCY	GRAM.	VOCAB.	COMPREH.
1.	II	XI	D+	D+	D	C	D
2.	IV	XIII	B-	B	B-	B	B+
3.	V	X	B-	C+	C+	C+	B+
4.	III	XV	B	B-	B	B+	A-
5.	V	XVI	D+	C+	C-	B-	A-
6.	VI	XII	D	B+	D+	C	A-
7.	VIII	XIV	B+	B-	C+	B-	B-
8.	IX	XIII	B+	B-	C+	C+	B
9.	I	XI	C	C-	D+	D	C+
10.	VII	X	B+	A-	A-	A-	A
11.	IV	XVI	C	C+	C-	C-	C
12.	VI	XIV	C+	B	B-	C+	B
13.	VIII	XII	C-	F	F	F	D
14.	V	XIII	B	B+	B	B	B+
15.	II	XI	C	C	C-	D	D
16.	III	XV	C-	C	C-	B-	C
17.	VIII	XII	D	D	D-	C	C+
18.	V	XVI	F	F	F	F	F
19.	VII	XIV	B+	A	B+	A	A
20.	VI	X	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+
21.	IV	XI	B	B+	B	B-	B-
22.	I	XIII	B+	A	B+	C+	B+
23.	IX	X	C+	C	C	D	D-
24.	II	XV	C+	C	D+	D	D
25.	VIII	XII	B-	C	C	C	C+

Table 3

STUDENT NO.	YEARS OF PREVIOUS FRENCH	OPINION	
1.		2	I don't like foreign languages. I was out six weeks, but in this class I can catch up, not in others. Stories are interesting, lots of participation in class.
2.		1	Much profit from the tapes, vocabulary and pronunciation. The student has a feeling of responsibility, you teach yourself you go at your own pace.
3.	2	2	If you're weak, you can't help but get it, it's like having a tutor right there. If you're good, you can go fast. It's good to have the class ; it motivates you, the personal contact.
4.	2	1	Compared with high school, you talk more, more than one exercise on one idea, you keep at it until you know it ; you know when you're right. You appreciate it more, participating all the time.
5.	0	1	I had Spanish by the old method, this one amazes me. The material is in the right sequence, contrary to old.
6.	2	2	Tapes are good, for pronunciation. But for reading, I would like more class work. I don't always understand it. (Very heavy Italian accent.)
7.	0	1	At my age it's not easy ; you need the practice, you get it. It's the pleasantest and most rewarding course I've ever had. But you must be willing to work. I'm a teacher and psychology major. I'm going to teach French, I enjoy it so much.
8.	0	1	My aptitude was 15 per cent ; I'm doing well. You have to know one section before going on. Most students need this. The professor is tops, one of the best I've had.

STUDENT NO.	YEARS OF PREVIOUS FRENCH	OPINION	
9.	0	2	Going at your own pace is good, but not as much conversation as I'd like. Drill and constant practice is good ; you use what you've learned I like it.
10.	0	1	(Native Spanish - Cuba) You learn faster, get more practice.
11.	2 yrs.- 25 yrs. ago	?	I have no basis for comparison, but my experience has been very rewarding, have enjoyed it a great deal, I've accomplished more than I would have otherwise. There's discipline built in.
12.	0	1	I took a regular section last year. Both teachers excellent.. I enjoy this more because (1) more practice in pronunciation, (2) I go at my own pace. If I lose a week. I can catch up. (Native Hindi).
13.	0	1	I've been out ill, missed three weeks ono month ago. It helps to participate all the time, you get the basics.
14.	H.S.- 3	1	no time
15.	0	?	I can't compare, but this course is enjoyable, I would recommend it ; an easy way to learn.
16.	a little FLES	3- 1+	If just a requirement. If you want to really learn French.
17.	H.S.- 2	4	I liked this at first, not now. It takes more time. We're not forced to go to lab, it's harder to keep up. In a regular class you feel that you have to prepare. In our class there's too much pressure.
18.	0	1	I seldom get beyond the first semester ; as an older person. I'm sure I've done better with this program.

STUDENT NO.	YEARS OF PREVIOUS FRENCH	OPINION	
19.	0	1	You develop at your own speed, it depends on you, not so much on the teacher. I like the tapes, you can catch up if you fall behind.
20.	H.S.- 2	1 3	If no French before. If French before. It's boring, you skip too much, you think you know it, and you don't.
21.	H.S.- 1 1/2.	2	If you want to speak it, learn it and remember it, even for reading. A marvelous program. I had a block against French and I'm losing it. The professor has a lot to do with it, he's done a lot for me.
22.	H.S.- 2 yrs. 3 yrs. ago	2	You get the fundamentals, the grammar. You can't help but learn it. I dislike the lack of rules ; it's hard to tell what to do just from examples. Also the phonetic symbols ; you don't need them.
23.	H.S.- 1	1	You learn better pronunciation ; it's better every year, especially for pronunciation and conversation.
24.	0	1	It offers a lot of freedom to work hard on something you don't understand, work at your own pace. You can make up work you miss. It's interesting.
25.	H.S.- 2	1	A friend of mine was in a regular section, he gave it up, not interested, couldn't keep up with it. Illness in family held me up this semester, but I can catch up. It's interesting, I like it.

Table 4

OPINIONS, 1964

1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1

2,2

3 MEDIAN -1

4,4,4,4

5

OPINIONS, 1965

1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1

2,2,2,2,2,2

MEDIAN -1

3,3

4

NOTE : Some students, in both 1964 and 1965, gave two different ratings based on two different sets of criteria.

Table 5 - Pronunciation
1964

B+, B+

B , B , B , B , B

B-, B-, B-, B-

C+, C+

C MEDIAN - C+

C-, C-, C-, C-, C-

D+, D+, D+

D

D-

1965 - (Data from Table 1)

A-

B+, B+, B+, B+, B+

B , B , B , B , B , B , B , B , B

B-

C+, C+, C+ , C+ MEDIAN - B

C

C- , C-

D , D

1965 - Data from Table 2

B+, B+, B+, B+, B+, B+

B , B , B

B-, B-, B-

C+, C+, C+

C , C , C MEDIAN - C+

C-, C-

D+, D+

D , D

F

Table 6 - Fluency

1964

A-

B+, B+

B , B , B

B-, B-, B-, B-

C+, C+, C+, C+ MEDIAN - C+

C-, C-

D , D , D , D , D , D

D-

F

1965 - Data from Table 1

A-, A-

B+, B+, B+

B , B , B , B , B , B

B-, B-

C+, C+

C , C MEDIAN - B-

C-,C-

D+

D , D , D

D-, D-

1965 - Data from Table 2

A , A

A-

B+, B+, B+, B+

B , B

B-, B-, B-

C+, C+, C+ MEDIAN - C+

C , C , C , C , C

C-

D+

D

F , F

Table 7 - Grammar

1964

B+, B+

B , B

B-, B-, B-, B-

C+, C+

C , C , C MEDIAN - C

C-, C-

D , D , D

D-, D-

F , F , F , F

1965 - Data from Table 1

A-, A-

B+, B+, B+

B , B , B , B , B

B-, B-

C+, C+, C+

C MEDIAN - C+

C-

D+, D+, D+

D , D

D-, D-

F

1965 - Data from Table 2

A-

B+, B+, B+

B , B , B

B-, B-

C+, C+, C+

C , C MEDIAN - C

C-, C-, C-, C-

D+, D+, D+

D

D-

F , F

Table 8 - Vocabulary

1964

B+, B+, B+

B , B , B , B , B , B

B-, B-

C+, C+, C+

C , C MEDIAN - C+

C-, C-

D+, D+

D , D , D

F

1965 - Data from Table 1

A

A-, A-

B+, B+, B+

B , B , B

B-, B-, B-, B-

C+, C+ MEDIAN - B-

C-

D+

D , D, D , D , D , D
D-
F

1965 - Data from Table 2

A
A-
B+, B+
B , B
B-, B-, B-, B-   MEDIAN - C+
C+, C+, C+, C+
C , C , C , C
C-
D , D , D , D
F , F

Table 9 - Comprehension

1964

A
A-, A-, A-, A-
B+, B+, B+, B+, B+
B , B
B-
C , C , C   MEDIAN - B
C-
D+
D
D-
F , F, F , F

1965 - Data from Table 1

A

A-, A-, A-, A-, A-

B+, B+, B+, B+, B+

B , B , B , B

B-

C   MEDIAN - B

C-, C-

D+, D+, D+

D , D

D-

1965 - Data from Table 2

A , A

A-, A-, A-

B+, B+, B+, B+, B+

B , B

B-   MEDIAN - B

C+, C+, C+

C , C

D , D , D , D , D

F

STUDENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

by Dr. Robert Harris
University of Akron

Introduction:

The learner's attitude can strongly influence the results. It is debatable whether a favorable attitude will greatly improve the results. However, a strongly negative attitude tends to impede learning. Certainly the aversive features of the task are likely to discourage the practice necessary to acquiring a given skill.

Negative attitudes which have been isolated and are attributable to certain features of a course might be changed through appropriate measures. For this reason an attitude survey of the students taking the French Program has been requested by the Project Director

The Problem

A common complaint heard from students enrolled in programmed sections of introductory French concerns the amount of time they are required to devote to the course. They claim that in spite of relative ease it takes an undue amount of their time to satisfy the requirements. This is particularly the case with drop out students, but is not infrequent with others.

Observations by the teaching faculty on student performance do not substantiate the argument that those enrolled in programmed courses spend more time then those in traditional sections: eight to ten hours per week appears to be standard for both groups. The question this report attempts to answer, then, is why programmed instruction students feel the course makes undue demands on their time.

The complaint of these students is of a very general nature and likely reflects some other more basic problem in learning by programmed techniques. The purpose of this research is an attempt to define the underlying problem of these students. It ought to be clarified that we do not regard the complaint of time involvement a serious problem nor is it central to this study. Rather such a complaint is considered symptomatic of more specific and basic difficulties experienced by these students.

Subjects: Twenty students, enrolled in programmed sections, and twenty in the traditional introductory French courses were administered an attitude survey designed to evaluate their reaction to learnimg French by means of materials other than text books and class room discussion. The students were chosen at random from the enrollment in first year French.

Attitude Scale: From an extensive series of scales designed by Harrison and MacLean (1964) to evaluate motivational factors in the study of French, 22 items were selected from 4 sub-scales. a) a 4 item scale designed to measure the attitudes about the usefulness of new media, b) a 5 item scale designed to examine attitudes toward spoken French, c) a 10 item scale designed to examine the student's reaction toward the ease of studying through a program, d) a 3 item scale designed to evaluate how the students feel about what they have gotten from the French course.

These scales were selected arbitrarily. The new media scale was selected for obvious reasons. The program method is a new one for these students. The attitude towards speech scale was selected because it appeared to be applicable particularly to a program which calls itself an audio-lingual program. The ease of learning scale was selected because it appeared to be particularly sensitive to differences in attitude induced by different methods of learning. The achievement scale was selected because it was standardized on student ratings of a film. A modification of the focus of the scale to learning by tape in the laboratory brings about a more specific analysis of the instrument of presentation, in this case the programmed tapes.

All scales showed high inter-test reliability in their original application to French language students in the study conducted by Harrison and McLean; therefore, they would appear to be applicable to the current study. Slight modifications in wording were made when warranted by differences in methods between the students investigated by Harrison and McLean and those in this study. Furthermore, slight modifications in wording were necessary to accommodate differences in the program of the two groups involved in our study.

The scales were used on the method of Guttman (1950) and will not be described in detail here. The interested reader[1] can refer to the original manuscript of Harrison an McLean for a better understanding of this approach. Simply, the technique obtains from the subject a quantitative score based on his endorsement of each of the items in the scale. From the individual's score, it is possible to compare his attitude with that of other students.

At the end of the attitude survey, students in both groups were asked two open-end answer questions: a. What in the teaching of this course do you like the most? b. What in the teaching of this course do you dislike most? A content analysis was made on the answers to these questions.

Result and Discussion

A. Scale data

The mean score of the groups on each sub-scale and the test of the significance of the difference of these mean scores are as follows:

---

[1] George P. Borglum, Report about Modern Language Audio Visual Research Project, Wayne State University, March 1964. pp 32 ff.

	Experimented Students	Control Students	
new media scale:	3.1	2.9	not statistically significant beyond the .10 level
attitude toward speech scale	3.6	3.2	not statistically significant beyond the .10 level
ease of learning scale	2.9	2.8	not statistically significant beyond the .10 level
achievement scale	1.9	2.7	is statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence

A low score, one being the lowest possible score, indicates a very favorable attitude toward the items in a scale. A median score, that is a score of three, represents a neutral attitude. A high score, five being the highest possible score, reveals a strong aversion to the items.

It is obvious that both groups of students, those taught by the program and those in the control sections, indicate indifference to the tapes, the language laboratory, and the programming techniques in so far as their novelty, the oral aspects of the language and the ease of learning are concerned. They showed neither aversion nor great enthusiasm toward these three particular parameters.

A difference was shown in the attitude of both groups towards achievement from the tapes as an instructional medium. This difference might be expected on the basis of nothing more than the increased concentration of the programmed tapes. It is of interest to discover that the experimental group was rather favorably disposed towards the programmed tape instruction.

From the attitude survey little can be said about the problems the students seemed to evidence in a number of interviews. To be sure, the scales were not directed to the question of time involvement.

But it does eliminate dissatisfaction with the technology of programmed instruction as a factor. That is, the strangeness of the programmed method, its ease as a teaching technique, and its utility as an aid in learning the language cannot be considered aversive.

B. Content Analysis of Questionnaire.

The limited data provided by two questions and small groups does not lend itself readily to a meaningful content analysis. It is difficult to establish many meaningful categories.

Two categories, however, appeared to be sufficiently inclusive for most of the statements made by the subjects. A personal category and a technique category are evident and permit some differentiation of the two groups.

1. The personal category consists of statements relating to the teacher's role, the learner's interest in the language and the people, and his ability to converse in French. The control group favorably mentioned this category more frequently than the group in programmed learning. This probably reflects the fact that the control students have more opportunity to express themselves about these matters than the experimental students. The question whether or not they actually possess more information is irrelevant. What is important is that these factors appear to motivate them more. Few of the programmed people mentioned anything about the language and its people, or the teacher relationship. Although the programmed course provides a considerable wealth of information about the people and the language, the experimental students do not consider this parameter important in the evaluation of the course, perhaps because they do not have enough class-room opportunity to discuss these topics.

When the experimental subjects discussed inter-personal motivation factors their comments were directed towards the lack of extensive inter-action between instructor and students. Again not more than a third of the experimental students mentioned this. Almost no comments of this nature were made by the control students.

2. The technique category consists in statements relating to students' study methods, their time involvement, their command of the language and difficulty with the material. In eighty per cent of the cases the experimental students commented favorably on this aspect of the course. Principally they commented on the pacing of their study, the sequence of material presentation, the feed back of information, and their knowledge of the particulars involved (syntax and morphology). It might be pointed out that these are the very principles on which programmed instruction is based. In only a few cases did members of the control group mention favorably technical aspects of the material or their approach to learning.

Dislikes in this category were prominent in both groups. Approximately half of the control subjects mentioned the difficulty in learning grammar, a common phenomenon in foreign language learning. Half of the experimental students reported that the tapes bored them. In addition, a few reported that when their answers were erroneous they did not know how to correct their response because they were not aware of where the error was. These are primarily visual minded students who need a printed confirmation. This problem is inherent in any audio-lingual program becaus it does not exert the control which a teaching machine has over the learner. That is to say, the tapes do not tell the student in so many words that his response was correct or incorrect. The programmed tapes rely on the student's comparison between his response and an oral model.

The questionnaire data substantiate the favorable attitude shown by the experimental subjects towards the mechanics of the program. The experimental students show a favorable attitude toward the study methods imposed by the program, and the arrangement of the material. They enjoy their involvement. It may appear paradoxical that these same students frequently report that they are bored. The question, therefore, arises as to why the students claim to be bored. Furthermore, what significance does this factor play in the general complaint in time of involvement? It appears to the author that these two questions are intimately related if not a differential expression of the same underlying complaint.

An explanation of these two complaints - boredom ; time involvement may be found in several conditions peculiar to the two groups: The experimental students spend two to three times as many hours with tapes in the laboratory as those in the control groups. This is tedious. It is only a rare student who enjoys spending lengthy sessions under the control of a machine in a solitary cubicle. Such confinement is contradictory to the study habits of the vast majority of students. The feeling of confinement mentioned here is heightened in this particular laboratory (humorously dubbed Plato's cave) because of its physical arrangement, lack of windows, type of lighting, and the feeling of closeness created by air-conditioning. Furthermore, the student is sujected to the intense concentration demands of programmed materials. This also is quite foreign and fatiguing to students who have been conditioned to the informal study method characteristic of their previous education.

The paradox might be resolved in terms of the focus of the student's interest. When he is considering the specific characteristics of learning French, he can be enthusiastic about the techniques. When he expresses his general feelings about learning French, he is more likely to focus on the aversive features with which he is confronted daily and which might be interfering with more pleasurable activities. It would follow then that he magnifies the extent of the time demands placed upon him by the "boring" lab sessions. This is particularly the case when it is rememberd that the student must spend time in the laboratory during those periods of the day which he considers most valuable for social activities and employment. He much prefers doing his class preparation at night.

On the basis of this survey it seems apparent that the French program itself is not responsible for the student's feeling of tedium and undue time demands. It would appear that the responsible factor lies in such motivational conditions as lack of interpersonal interaction, and the fatigue brought about by intensive concentration. The resolution of the complaint of boredom and perhaps time involvement would appear to depend on alleviating the study conditions in the laboratory and/or the techniques imposed by the programmed tapes.

Questionnaire used in the attitude survey

I strongly agree	I agree	I am undecided	I disagree	I strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5

1. I think I can learn more from a book which has pictures in it than from one which does not.

2. I generally learn more in classes that use movies, slides, pictures, and charts than in classes that just use books and tapes.

3. If I had my choice, I would rather not use a tape in which all the talking is in a foreign language that is unfamiliar to me.

4. A school book is likely to be more helpful than a tape recorder to someone who wants to learn French.

5. If I could spend a month in France right now I could learn more French than I could learn from a year in French classes.

6. I have never heard my French teacher pronounce a whole word ; there is always some part missing.

7. It is easier to understand someone speaking French if you can watch his face and gestures.

8. I feel that my pronunciation of French is spoiled by hearing other members of my class.

9. French people do not seem to speak French as clearly as we speak English.

10. The French language is easier than the German language or the Russian language.

11. I feel that I can learn a foreign language better than most students.

12. The French language is easier than the Spanish language.

13. As far as learning to read French is concerned, the tapes are:

    a. the most useful help I have
    b. among the most useful aids
    c. fairly useful
    d. not very useful to me
    e. quite useless
    f. the most useless aid I have

14. If I have a chance in the future to use more tapes of this kind

    a. I surely will try to
    b. I think I'd like to
    c. I may be interested in doing so.

d. I doubt if I would be interested
e. I wouldn't be very interested
f. I woudn't have anything to do with it.

15. If I were given the opportunity to use a tape like this in the future:

a. I would jump at the chance
b. I would like to use it again
c. I guess I would want to use it again
d. I would not care one way or the other
e. I would hesitate to use it again
f. I would not want to use it again

16. Now that I've used this tape:

a. I'm certainly glad I used it
b. I think it was probably a good tape for me to use.
c. I guess it was worth using
d. I have no opinion about it one way or the other
e. I think it was dull and boring
f. I think it was a waste of my time

17. In my future work the training obtained from this tape:

a. will be of great value to me
b. will probably help me a lot
c. should be of some value to me
d. will not be very helpful to me
e. will be of little use to me
f. will be of no use to me

18. If I were to describe this tape, I would say:

a. it is interesting and probably very useful
b. it is interesting and probably fairly useful
c. it is interesting and not too useful
d. it is uninteresting, but probably very useful
e. it is uninteresting, but probably fairly useful
f. it is uninteresting and not too useful

19. Using this tape:

a. will help me a great deal in learning French in the future
b. will help me quite a bit in learning French in the future
c. will help me some in learning French in the future

d. will help me little in learning French in the future
e. will help me not at all in learning French in the future

20. Using tapes like this in French class:

a. seems absolutely necessary to me
b. seems rather valuable to me
c. would be a good thing to do
d. is fairly important, I guess
e. is of no particular importance to me
f. is more or less a waste of time

21. My interest

a. is strongest during the first 15 to 30 minutes of work
b. remains strong throughout the tape session
c. is never strong as I work on the tapes

22. As I walk into the lab

a. I anticipate with relish the material to be learned
b. I am rather casual about the time to be spent working
c. I dread the time to be spent on the tapes

TABLE OF CONTENTS, Parts I and II

begins at frame no.

Problem 1: /i/ 1

Problem 2: /u/ 15

Problem 3: /e/ 30

Problem 4: /a/ 50

Problem 5: /o/ 70

Problem 6: final voiced consonants 90

Problem 7: open /e/ and /o/ 110

Problem 8: /p, t, k/ 130

Problem 9: /r/ 150

Problem 10: /ü/ 170

Problem 11: /ẅ/ 190

Problem 12: /l/ 200

Problem 13: /ã/ 220

Problem 14: /õ/ 240

Problem 15: /e/ 270

Problem 16: /ʒ/ 290

Problem 17: /ö/ 300

Problem 18: /ə/ 320

Problem 19: /ɲ/ 340

Problem 20: Review of some grammatical features 350

Reading 401

Intonation features 500

Stress through pitch and loudness 520

Basic vocabulary 525

TABLE OF CONTENTS, Part III

Problem 1: Present Tense
Verbs of the first group 221

Problem 2: Feminine-Masculine Contrast
he, she, it, they 224

Problem 3: Interrogative who 226

Problem 4: Feminine-Masculine Contrast of the Adjective . . 227

Problem 5: Conjugation of the Verb /etr/ - to be 236

Problem 6: Conjugation of the Verb /avwar/ - to have 239

Problem 7: Interrogatives /eskə/ - ?, /ki/ - who,
/keskə/ - what 242

Dialogue: Alain Fabre 245

Problem 8: Liaison Forms of the Determiners 247

Problem 9: Verbs of the Second Group 249

Problem 10: Prepositional Phrases with /a/ 257

Problem 11: Conjugation of /ale/ - to go 264

Problem 12: Three-Stem Verbs 266

Problem 13: Interrogative /u eskə/ - where 270

Dialogue: Nicole Suchard 272

Reading: La France et Paris 273

Problem 14
A. Prepositional Phrases Introduced by /d(ə)/ 274
B. Interrogatives Corresponding to the Prepositional
Phrases Introduced by /d(ə)/ 275
C. The Possessive Case 279

Dialogue: Nicole Suchard 283

Problem 15: The Infinitive 284

Dialogue: Les Etudes d'Alain 289

Problem 16: Verbs /puvwar/, /vulwar/, /fer/ 290

Dialogue: Les Préparatifs du Déjeuner 295

Reading: Le Reste de la France 296

Problem 17

Vocabulary 297
A. Two-Stem Verbs with Vowel Change 298
B. Verb /dir/ 303

Dialogue: Une Jeune Fille 304

Reading: La Gastronomie ou l'Art de Bien Manger 305

Problem 18

A. /dəvwar/, /bwar/, /rəsəvwar/ 306
B. /prãdr/ 310

Problem 19: Verbs with a /y/ sound 315

Dialogue: La Soirée Finit Mal 317

Reading: Les Repas 319

Problem 20: The Negative Pattern

Part 1 320
Part 2 321
Part 3 325

Dialogue: Un Accident et ses Conséquences 327

Problem 21: Passé Composé

Verbs of the first group 328
Part 2 332

Dialogue: Un Souvenir des Etats-Unis 335

Reading: L'Etiquette à Table 336

Problem 22: Passé Composé

Verbs of the second group 337

Dialogue: Une Danse et ses Conséquences 345

Problem 23: Passé Composé

Auxiliary Verb /etr/ 346

Dialogue: Bernard Valentin I 351

Dialogue: Bernard Valentin II, III 352

Reading: Les Plaisirs de la Vie 353

Problem 24

A. Adverbs of Time 354
B. Interrogative /kã/ - when 355

Dialogue: Le Dimanche, Jour de Visite 358

Problem 25: Irregular Past Participles
  A. In /ü/ 359
  B. In /i/ 362
  C. In /er/ 365

Reading: L'Envers des Plaisirs 369

Problem 26: French Articles
  A. In a Positive Statement 371
  B. In a Negative Statement 376

Problem 27: Numbers 0-20 380

Reading: Education Primaire 382

Problem 28: Demonstrative Determiners
  Part 1 383
  Part 2 384

Problem 29: Possessive Determiners
  A. Before a Consonant 387
  B. Before a Vowel Sound 389

Dialogue: Les Pommes Vertes 393

Problem 30: Pronoun /i/ 394

Reading: Education Secondaire 401

Problem 31: Pronoun /ã/ 403

Problem 32: Pronouns /lə, la, le/ 414

Dialogue: Ma Bicyclette 423

Reading: l'Adolescence 425

Dialogue: A la Boucherie 427

Problem 33: Some Indefinite Words 428

Dialogue: A l'Epicerie I 429

Problem 34: Pronoun /ã/ (cont.) 430

Dialogue: A l'Epicerie II 431

Problem 35: Review of /o/, /a la/ 432

Problem 36: Pronouns /lẅi/ and /lör/ 435

Dialogue: Les Plans de Michèle 444

Problem 37: Pronouns (mə, tə, nu, vu/ 445

Problem 38: Reflexive Verb Pattern

  A. Present Tense 454
  B. The Infinitive 455
  C. The Passé Composé 461

Dialogue: Le Nez Rouge 466

Reading: Le Bourgeois 467

Problem 39: The Adjective (Review)

  A. Agreement 471
  B. Word Order 471
  C. The Comparative 473
  D. The Superlative 477
  E. The Interrogative Word /ləkel/ 479

Dialogue: A la Boulangerie 481

Problem 40: The Future

  A. Verbs of the first group 483
  B. Verbs of the second group 489
  C. So-called "irregular" verbs 494

Dialogue: Dans le Train I 500

Dialogue: Dans le Train II 501

Reading: Le Paysan 501

Problem 41: Pronouns in Phrase Final Position

  A. After a Preposition 506
  B. After /s e/ 506

Problem 42: Adverbs 509

Dialogue: L'Argent, Quel Ennui! 512

Problem 43: Negative Words

  A. In the Present Tense 513
  B. In the Passé Composé 513
  C. With the Infinitive 513

Problem 44: Relative Pronouns

  A. /ki/ 518
  B. /k(ə)/ 519
  C. /u/ 519

Dialogue: Paris Coûte Cher 524

Reading: L'Ouvrier 524

Problem 45: Double Pronouns

  A. Word Order with /ã/ 525
  B. Word Order with /l(ə)/, /la/, /le/ 525

Problem 46: Double Pronouns /lə lẅi/, /lẅi ã/ 527

Dialogue: La Belle Robe 533

Problem 47: The Imparfait 534

Dialogue: Les Vieux 537

Problem 48: Interrogatives with Inverted Word Order
  A. Present Tense 538
  B. In the Passé Composé 542

Dialogue: On Va au Cinéma 544

Reading: Le Gouvernement Français 545

Problem 49: /kə/ Clauses in the Indicative 549

Problem 50: /kə/ Clauses in the Subjunctive 554
  Irregular Subjunctives 558
  Subjunctives with Two Stems 561

Dialogue: Un Rendez-Vous 568

Reading: Le Foyer 569

Problem 51: Patterns Using the Infinitive 573

Reading: L'Esprit Français 581

Problem 52: Conditional 586

Dialogue: Des Renseignements 588

Reading: Le Système D 589

Problem 53: "En" and Present Participle 593

Dialogue: Gagner de l'Argent 594

Reading: Le Français au Volant 595

Problem 54: "Tout" 599

Problem 55: The Numbers 600

Reading: La France Change de Visage 604

Problem 56: Expressions of Time 608

Reading: Littérature 611

Vocabulary 723

Summary of French Grammar 738

Index 770

FRENCH TEXT AND QUESTIONS OF DIALOGUES USED FOR LISTENING COMPREHENSION

Mlle Suchard 614

Les Etudes d'Alain 615

Une Jeune Fille 615

Un Accident et ses Conséquences 616

Une Danse et ses Conséquences 616

Bernard Valentin I 617

Bernard Valentin II 617

Le Dimanche, Jour de Visite 618

Les Pommes Vertes 618

Visiter le Texas 619

A l'Epicerie 619

Les Plans de Michèle 620

Le Nez Rouge 621

A la Boulangerie 621

Dans le Train I 622

Dans le Train II 623

L'Argent, Quel Ennui! 624

Paris Coûte Cher 624

La Belle Robe 625

Les Vieux 626

On Va au Cinéma 627

Un Rendez-Vous 628

Qui Va Faire la Cuisine 629

Des Renseignements 630

Gagner de l'Argent 630

FRAMES OMITTED IN PART II

529, 533, 536, 542, 549, 556, 557, 558, 567, 572, 574, 579,
583, 588, 594, 599, 604, 617, 618, 620, 626, 633, 667

FRAMES OMITTED IN PART III

701, 702, 707, 708, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 724, 725, 727,
728, 730, 731, 733, 740, 748, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759,
760, 762, 765, 766, 767, 768, 777, 783, 784, 785, 786, 791,
815, 817, 858, 859, 867, 869, 883, 884, 903, 931, 938, 945,
947, 953, 954, 973, 976, 977, 980, 982, 986, 990, 992, 993,
996, 1006, 1008, 1023, 1031, 1038, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1050,
1056, 1066, 1068, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079,
1088, 1092, 1094, 1112, 1113, 1114, 1121, 1125, 1127, 1133,
1137, 1141, 1142, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1175, 1176, 1177,
1178, 1179, 1180, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1193,
1194, 1195, 1196, 1197, 1198, 1205, 1214, 1224, 1127, 1228,
1231, 1233, 1234, 1235, 1236, 1240, 1241, 1242, 1246, 1247,
1248, 1254, 1256, 1257, 1258, 1271, 1274, 1275, 1279, 1283,
1286, 1291, 1316, 1317, 1325, 1327, 1329, 1333, 1337

FRAMES REPLACED IN PART III

703, 704, 706, 739, 744, 745, 774, 775, 776, 778, 781, 782,
789, 799, 800, 803, 804, 805, 806, 811, 813, 814, 823, 828,
829, 830, 831, 837, 842, 843, 844, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853,
854, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 874, 875, 876, 877,
879, 880, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 899, 900, 902, 904, 905,
906, 907, 909, 910, 913, 914, 917, 918, 919, 920, 922, 924,
932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 948, 949,
950, 951, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1021, 1022, 1027, 1035, 1080,
1081, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1143, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1148, 1149,
1151, 1153, 1160, 1165, 1168, 1206, 1239

OMITTED DIALOGUES

Le Bac - 845, Les Vacances - 953, De Sept Heures à Sept Heures - 973, Qu'est-ce qui est Important - 1009, Elle Veut Sortir - 1043, Les Cheveux Blonds - 1060, L'Epicerie Sale - 1074, Les Malheurs d'un Etudiant - 1094, Une Jeune Fille Bien Elevée - 1125, On Va Sortir - 1159, L'Esprit des Femmes - 1188, Il ne Faut pas Grossir - 1214, Jojo et Ses Devoirs - 1229, Rendre un Livre - 1238, Peut-on Fumer - 1286

EXAM IN PRONUNCIATION

Reading Aloud:
Bonjour Messieurs dames (õ, a) Je suis Bernard Valentin (ẅ, ã) Je suis né à Marseille dans le sud de la France (r, ü) J'ai étudié au lycée de Marseille (ü, e) J'ai fini mes études secondaires (t, õ) Apres mes études je suis parti de Marseille (z-, r) Je suis venu à Paris (ü, a) Je fais médecine à l'université (ü, er) J'aime Paris (p) Je suis devenu parisien (ẅ, ẽ)

EXAM AFTER FRAME 750

I. Give the French equivalent:
Example: I'm coming J'arrive
1. We are studying 2. They are working 3. You like the flower 4. I smoke a pipe 5. The children play 6. We are talking.

II. Answer according to the model:
Model: Qui est gros? Est-ce la dame? Oui, elle est grosse.

7. Qui est intelligent? Est-ce la dame? 8. Qui est beau? Est-ce Jeanne? 9. Qui est jeune? Est-ce Marie? 10. Qui est blond? Est-ce la fille? 11. Qui est vieux? Est-ce la dame? 12. Qui est nouveau? Est-ce le professeur? 13. Qui est bon? Est-ce maman? 14. Qui est méchant? Est-ce la fille?

III. Give the French equivalent:
Example: The lady is tall la dame est grande

15. Mary is happy 16. the lady is old 17. the car is red 18. the apple is good 19. the girl is pretty

IV. Answer according to the following model: (the subject for each is given)
Model: Qui est léger? L'enfant est léger

20. Qui est grand? (je) 21. Qui a des enfants? (je) 22. Qui a un livre? (vous) 23. Qui est à l'école? (nous) 24. Qui est à la maison? (les enfants) 25. Qui a des parents? (les enfants) 26. Qui est à Paris? (papa) 27. Qui a des vêtements? (nous)

V. Give the French equivalent:
Example: He is rich il est riche

28. We have money 29. I'm old 30. You have bread 31. You are small 32. We are poor 33. I have wine

EXAM AFTER FRAME 800

I. Give the French equivalent:
1. she is writing a letter 2. you are getting tall 3. we are reading a book 4. she is reading the paper 5. they are going

6. I'm selling 7. you are hearing 8. she is waiting 9. you
are going out 10. we are leaving 11. they serve wine 12. he is
driving 13. you are going 14. I'm going to town 15. to whom are
you writing? 16. she is selling the lady bread 17. I'm writing
the professor a letter 18. he is offering the girl a flower
19. I'm showing the man a book

II. Answer the questions with an appropriate reply. Use a complete sentence.

20. Qui lave la vaisselle? 21. Qu'est-ce que vous lisez? 22. Qu'est-
ce qu'il répare? 23. Qui conduit? 24. Qu'est-ce qu'il achète?
25. Qu'est-ce qu'elle trouve? 26. A qui parle-t-elle? 27. A qui
écrivez-vous? 28. Qui habite Strasbourg? 29. Qu'est-ce que les
étudiants font? 30. Qu'est-ce que vous faites? 31. Qu'est-ce
que vous aimez? 32. Qui travaille à l'université? 33. Qui est
jeune? 34. Est-ce que les professeurs sont jeunes?

EXAM AFTER FRAME 850

Change the following verbs into the plural:
1. il finit (ils) 2. je vends (nous) 3. elle sert (elles)
4. je sors (nous) 5. je vais (nous) 6. elle grandit (elles)
7. il va (ils) 8. je dors (nous) 9. je rougis (nous)
10. il conduit (ils) 11. je viens (nous) 12. il devient (ils)
13. je peux (nous) 14. il veut (ils) 15. tu fais (vous)

Give the French equivalent:
16. we can write 17. I want to work 18. they are going to study
19. you can come 20. you can leave 21. we are going to serve
22. I'm going to listen 23. she wants to get tall 24. she is
getting tall 25. we are getting tall 26. I'm going to sell the
car 27. he wants to punish the child 28. we can come back
29. he is speaking of the boy 30. I'm speaking of the children
31. he's coming from the bar 32. we are coming from the hotel
33. where is he coming from? 34. what is he speaking about?
35. of whom are they speaking? 36. where are they? 37. where are
they going? 38. the lady's clothes? 39. the student's book?
40. the children's clothes 41. the butcher's cigarettes

Answer the following questions:
Qui est Nicole Suchard? Qu'est-ce qu'elle étudie? Où est-ce
qu'elle étudie? Où est-ce qu'elle habite? Qui est Alain?
Qu'est-ce qu'il étudie?

EXAM AFTER FRAME 900

Give the French equivalent:
1. you are saying 2. we are drinking 3. I understand 4. they see
5. we are calling 6. she is drinking 7. I'm receiving 8. I'm
calling 9. I spoke 10. we ate dinner 11. they bought flowers
12. we don't sell meat 13. I don't find flowers 14. he doesn't
have any clothes 15. they don't buy any books

Give the form of the verb requested:
16. nous buvons (je) 17. nous comprenons (il) 18. elle reçoit (vous) 19. je crois (nous) 20. nous devons (il) 21. nous disons (vous) 22. vous appelez (j') 23. nous jetons (je) 24. j'ai parlé (nous) 25. il a acheté (ils) 26. j'ai déjeuné (vous)

Change the following sentences into the negative:
27. je dîne 28. il faut manger 29. je trouve des fruits 30. il faut chercher des légumes 31. nous allons dîner 32. vous pouvez boire du vin

Answer the following questions based on the stories:
La soirée finit mal
33. Jean et Nicole, où est-ce qu'il vont? 34. Qu'est-ce que Nicole veut faire? 35. Qu'est-ce que Jean veut faire?
Un Accident
36. Qui descend d'une auto? 37. Qui parait furieux? 38. Qu'est-ce qu'ils font au café?

Reading Comprehension: Indicate whether the following statements are true or false (T or F):
39. La ménagère consacre une grande partie de la journée à la cuisine. 40. Les femmes vantent le talent culinaire des hommes. 41. La ménagère française doit employer beaucoup de talents pour préparer des repas excellents. 42. La nourriture est la défense principale de la famille. 43. Les économies nécessaires sont un des plaisirs de la vie. 44. Au petit déjeuner les Français mangent des oeufs et du pain. 45. On mange du pain avec chaque repas. 46. On boit du "vin ordinaire" au petit déjeuner. 47. Les enfants coupent leur vin, c'est-à-dire, ils mettent de l'eau dans le vin. 48. Les repas français ne rassasient pas, c'est-à-dire, ils n'apaisent pas le faim.

EXAM AFTER FRAME 950

I. Give the French equivalent:
1. I finished 2. We succeeded 3. She chose 4. They wrote 5. They sold 6. I answered 7. You waited 8. You didn't finish 9. I didn't succeed 10. They didn't write 11. They came 12. He came down 13. She went in 14. I didn't go up 15. We didn't come back

II. Change the verbs into the passé composé:
16. elle rougit 17. je vends 18. nous écrivons 19. vous grandissez 20. je ne finis pas 21. il n'écrit pas 22. elle arrive 23. je descend 24. vous entrez 25. elle ne revient pas 26. nous montons 27. il ne sort pas 28. il reste 29. je ne vais pas 30. Ils vont en classe.

III. Change into the past tense: (irregular participles)
31. je bois 32. ils mettent 33. nous prenons 34. vous lisez 35. elle ouvre 36. vous voyez 37. je vais 38. nous connaissons

IV. Answer with what seems appropriate. Use a complete sentence and the same tense as in the question.
39. Quand est-ce que vous êtes arrivé en classe? 40. Où est-ce que vous êtes né? 41. Est-ce que vous habitez avec vos parents? 42. Où est-ce que vous mangez? 43. Qu'est-ce que vous étudiez? 44. Quand est-ce que vous avez dansé? 45. Où est-ce que vous avez dansé? 46. Est-ce que vous êtes resté à Akron dimanche? (give negative answer) 47. Où est-ce que vous êtes allé dimanche?

EXAM AFTER FRAME 1000

Give the French equivalent:
1. his eyes 2. his flower 3. her work 4. her money 5. his letter 6. his head 7. her plates 8. her clothes 9. their books 10. their newspaper 11. my children 12. your friends 13. your car 14. my dress 15. we didn't eat bread 16. I didn't drink water 17. she didn't buy shoes 18. I didn't come 19. she didn't leave 20. they didn't buy clothes 21. he didn't go out 22. he will go out 23. we will leave 24. she will sell her car

25. Qu'est-ce que vous avez bu? 26. Qu'est-ce que vous avez acheté? 27. Où est-ce que vous avez mangé? 28. Quand est-ce que vous êtes parti? 29. Où est-ce que vous êtes allé? 30. Quand est-ce que vous êtes sorti? 31. Qu'est-ce que vous avez reçu? 32. Qu'est-ce que vous allez acheter? 33. Quand est-ce que vous allez arriver? 34. Qu'est-ce que vous allez étudier? 35. Qu'est-ce que vous allez prendre?

Dialogue: Mes études.
36. Pourquoi est-ce que vous avez choisi la médecine?
37. Comment est le travail? 38. Comment sont les examens?
39. Quand est-ce que vous avez passé l'examen? 40. Est-ce que vous avez réussi?

Dialogue: Les Pommes Vertes.
41. Est-ce que vous voulez des pommes? 42. Est-ce que vous avez de l'argent? 43. Comment sont les pommes? 44. Pourquoi est-ce que vous ne voulez pas les pommes?

EXAM AFTER FRAME 1039

Give the French equivalent:
1. I am going there. 2. We are staying there 3. They aren't going there 4. I slept there (tense) 5. We went there (aux. verb) 6. He didn't stay there 7. I'm selling some (pron.) 8. she has some 9. We bought some (tense) 10. I didn't eat any 11. He likes her 12. She punishes him 13. I see them 14. She saw him (tense) 15. We found them 16. We didn't find them

Answer using the appropriate pronoun:
17. Vous restez à l'école? Oui, 18. Vous allez en ville? Oui, 19. Vous avez attendu en ville? Oui, 20. Vous êtes allé en classe? Non, 21. Vous achetez du pain? Oui, 22. Vous vendez

des légumes? Non, 23. Vous avez trouvez des livres? Oui,
24. Vous avez bu de la bière? Non, 25. Elle a choisi des chaussures? Non, 26. Vous cherchez le livre? Oui, 27. Vous vendez
la robe? Oui, 28. Vous aimez la dame? Oui, Vous avez écrit
la lettre? Oui, 30. Vous avez trouvé les vêtements? Oui,
31. Vous avez vendu l'auto? Non,

La Visite au Texas (sentences are not required)
32. Qu'est-ce que la jeune fille étudie? 33. Qu'est-ce qu'elle
veut faire? 34. Qu'est-ce qu'elle veut voir au Texas? 35. Où
est-ce qu'elle en a déjà vu? 36. Est-ce qu'elle veut enseigner?

EXAM AFTER FRAME 1100

In the following sentences substitute in the blank spaces the
pronoun needed to make sense.
1. Je ___ ai acheté des fleurs. 2. Papa ___ a attendu au restaurant.
3. Marie ___ est restée. 4. On ___ a donné du vin. 5. La jeune
fille ne ___ plaît pas. 6. Je vais ___ servir du café. 7. Il ___
vend. 8. Le professeur ___ a répondu.

Answer using the appropriate pronoun. Use the same tense as in the
question. Answer in the affirmative.
9. Qui a mangé du pain? 10. Est-ce que vous avez pris les livres?
11. Vous avez parlé à la dame? 12. Vous avez vu mon fils?
13. Vous êtes allé à Paris? 14. Vous êtes resté en France?
15. Vous avez attendu votre fille? 16. A qui avez-vous donné
des fleurs? 17. Vous allez parler à Jeanne? 18. Vous allez
vendre la maison? 19. Qu'est-ce que vous allez donner à Marie?
20. Est-ce qu'on vous attend? 21. Qui vous parle? 22. Qui vous
a vu? 23. Est-ce que papa vous a puni? 24. Qu'est-ce qu'on vous
a servi? 25. Qu'est-ce que maman vous a donné?

Answer in the negative:
26. Vous avez attendu votre fille? 27. Vous avez bu du vin?
28. Vous avez trouvé vos vêtements? 29. Vous avez parlé aux enfants?
30. Vous êtes allé en France? 31. Vous avez dormi au bureau?
32. Vous allez parler à Jeanne? 33. Maman vous a puni? 34. La
jeune fille vous plaît? 35. Le professeur vous a répondu?

Les Plans de Michèle. Answer:
36. Où veut-elle aller? 37. Qu'est-ce qu'elle veut faire aux
Etats-Unis? 38. Est-ce qu'elle a de l'argent? 39. Qui peut
l'aider? 40. Qu'est-ce qu'elle peut faire en Amérique?

EXAM AFTER FRAME 1150

Review:
1. I went there 2. I don't know him 3. She found them 4. He
drank it 5. I didn't punish him 6. He didn't finish it 7. He
saw me 8. She spoke to us 9. I gave her flowers 10. We gave
them a book

Change into the passé composé:
11. il se lave 12. on nous écrit 13. je ne me lève pas 14. il m'attend 15. il se repose 16. je m'excuse

Answer the following questions using the same tense as in the question:
17. Est-ce qu'on vous a réveillé? 18. Quand est-ce que vous vous êtes levé? 19. Qui s'est trompé? 20. Est-ce que vous vous rasez? 21. Quand est-ce que maman vous a réveillé?

Comparative and superlative:
22. George is taller than mother. 23. She is as intelligent as John. 24. She is prettier than her mother. 25. He is less intelligent than his father. 26. He is the tallest of the children. 27. Which one is the poorest?

Le Nez Rouge:
28. Pourquoi est-ce que Claude a le nez rouge? 29. Pourquoi est-ce qu'il boit? 30. Qu'est-ce qu'on fait pour se réchauffer? 31. Quand est-ce qu'on boit du café?

EXAM AFTER FRAME 1200

Answer in the future:
Vous buvez du café? Vous prenez le train? Vous connaissez madame? Elles apprennent le français? L'enfant boit du lait? Les enfants font leurs devoirs? Vous finissez vos devoirs? Vous avez vendu l'auto? Vous êtes à Paris? Papa va à Paris? Vous avez de l'argent? Qui tient le livre? Les enfants sont venus?

Change the following sentences into the passé composé (review):
J'arrive à Paris. Je me trompe. Le professeur m'excuse. Je lui parle. Papa se rase. Il ne s'arrête pas. Je ne me dépêche pas. On vous sert. Jean me voit. On ne nous trouve pas.

Use a pronoun in the following blank spaces:
C'est ____. Jean vient avec ____. L'étudiant reste chez ____. Est-ce maman? Oui c'est ____.

Dans le Train: Answer according to the story:
Où est-ce qu'on va arriver? D'où vient la jeune fille? Qu'est-ce qu'elle va faire à Paris? Quelle est l'occupation du jeune homme? Qu'est-ce qu'il va faire à Paris? Qui attend la jeune fille à la gare?

EXAM AFTER FRAME 1250

Answer in the future (future tense):
1. Vous allez en ville? 2. Vous dormez? 3. Vous finissez le travail? 4. Vous lisez le livre? 5. Vous revenez? 6. Vous avez vu le professeur? 7. Vous faites vos devoirs? 8. Vous êtes riche?

9. Vous avez de l'argent? 10. Vous servez du café?

Supply the missing word (relative pronoun):
11. C'est un magasin ___ on vend des vêtements. 12. J'aime la
robe ___ elle porte. 13. C'est le marchand ___ vend les légumes.
14. C'est le fils ___ j'ai puni. 15. Voilà la boulangerie ___
j'achète du pain.

Answer the following questions using the same tense as in the
question. Use an object pronoun (le, la, les, en, lui, leur,
me, nous, etc.) where possible.
16. Quand est-ce que vous vous êtes levé? 17. Où est-ce que vous
m'avez vu? 18. Vous avez réveillé les enfants? 19. Quand est-ce
que vous êtes revenu? 20. Vous vous êtes trompé? 21. Vous avez
arrêté l'auto? 22. Qui vous a attendu? 23. Quand est-ce qu'on
vous attendra? 24. Où est-ce que vous attendrez la dame?

Answer the questions, but use déjà in each response.
25. Vous avez travaillé? 26. Vous avez fini les devoirs? 27. Vous
vous êtes réveillé? 28. Vous l'avez vu?

Supply the missing word. It could be an auxiliary verb, pronoun...
29. Je ___ allé à Paris. J'___ étudié à la Sorbonne. ___ suis
parti pour voir la province. 30. J'ai parlé ___ habitants de la
province. Je ___ ai compris. Ils m'___ montré la ville.
31. Maintenant je ___ écrit une lettre pour les remercier.

EXAM AFTER FRAME 1300

Review: Answer using the tense used in the question. Use pronouns
where possible.
1. Quand est-ce que vous vous êtes levé? 2. Qu'est-ce que vous
ferez ce soir? 3. Qu'est-ce que vous avez fait hier soir?
4. Qu'est-ce que vous faites aujourd'hui? 5. Qu'est-ce qu'on vous
apporte? 6. Qui vous a vu au magasin? 7. Où est-ce qu'on vous
a attendu? 8. Est-ce que vous vous êtes trompé? 9. Où est-ce
que vous êtes allé hier? 10. Où est-ce que vous avez trouvé
la chemise? 11. Qui a répondu au professeur? 12. A qui avez-vous
écrit?

Use a negative word in your reply: jamais, rien.
13. Qu'est-ce que vous avez acheté? 14. Est-ce que vous avez
étudié? 15. Est-ce qu'elle reste dans la rue? 16. Est-ce qu'elle
étudiera en classe? 17. Est-ce que vous finirez vos devoirs?
18. Qu'est-ce que vous prendrez? 19. Qu'est-ce que vous avez bu?
20. Est-ce que vous êtes allé en France?

Fill in the missing element (relative pronouns).
21. C'est le magasin ___ je travaille. 22. Voilà la dame ___
enseigne le français. 23. J'aime le livre ___ j'ai acheté.
24. C'est l'épicier ___ vend des légumes. 25. Les légumes ___
l'épicier vend sont bons.

Other pronouns of all kinds:
26. Je ___ suis réveillé ce matin. 27. Je ___ ai vu en classe. 28. Voilà mon professeur; je ___ ai répondu. 29. Voilà mes enfants. Je ___ ai donné du lait. 30. Le jeune homme ___ est excusé. 31. Le professeur ne ___ est pas trompé. 32. Du vin? Je n'___ ai pas.

Other items to be substituted:
33. Je crois ___ il est parti. 34. Vous croyez ___ Jean viendra? 35. Papa a écrit ___ il viendra demain.

Translate:
36. I believe he came. 37. He wrote that he'll come. 38. Mother says she is studying.

Répondez:
39. Pourquoi Michèle n'est-elle pas prête? 40. Qu'est-ce qu'elle va porter si on va au cinéma? 41. Où est-ce qu'ils iront?

EXAM AFTER FRAME 1362

1. On réussit en ___ (travailler). 2. On trouve en ___ (chercher). 3. Il faut ___ (travailler). 4. J'ai décidé _____ (lui répondre).

5. I ask you to drive. 6. I want him to wait. 7. I forgot to study. 8. I told him to come. 9. I am studying (être en train). 10. I want to leave. 11. Dad wants me to finish.

Change to the future:
12. Je bois. 13. elles finissent 14. nous comprenons 15. vous allez 16. je suis 17. vous avez 18. elle vient 19. vous connaissez 20. ils écrivent

Change to the subjunctive by adding il faut:
21. nous finissons 22. je finis 23. elle répond 24. vous attendez 25. nous avons de l'argent 26. il est malade 27. je fais mes devoirs 28. je pars

Fill In:
J'___ bu ___ vin ce matin. Je ___ venu ___ la France. Je ___ arrivé ___ classe ____ 8 heures. J'ai commencé ___ faire mes devoirs.

ORAL EXAMINATION I
EXAM ABOUT DIALOGUES
Les Plans de Michèle - Paris Coûte Cher

True-False Statements:
Les Plans de Michèle
1. Michèle veut aller aux Etats-Unis. 2. Elle est allée voir le professeur d'Anglais à l'université de Paris. 3. Michèle a l'argent nécessaire pour étudier à une université américaine. 4. Elle a gagné l'argent en aidant un professeur de français à Paris.

5. Elle a donné des leçons de français à des étudiants à l'université de Paris. 6. Dans une université américaine on peut étudier et travailler. 7. Elle doit écrire à un ami du professeur d'anglais qui est professeur à l'université de New York. 8. Michèle a reçu une invitation du professeur américain à venir aux Etats-Unis.

Dans le Train:
9. Le train doit arriver à Paris à onze heures et demie. 10. La jeune fille veut voir sa famille pour quelques jours. 11. Le jeune homme vient à Paris pour chercher du travail dans la capitale. 12. Il a un frère à Paris qui l'attend dans un café des Champs Elysées. 13. Le jeune homme et la jeune fille ont décidé de voir Paris en métro. 14. Une amie attend la jeune fille à la gare en auto. 15. En autobus on peut voir Paris la nuit. C'est joli. 16. La jeune fille a refusé de prendre un verre au café avec l'ingénieur.

Paris Coûte Cher:
17. Claude est revenu de Paris parce qu'il a dépensé tout son argent. 18. Claude est revenu quand il n'a pas trouvé de travail à Paris. 19. Il a bien mangé à Paris dans les restaurants de la ville. 20. Il a passé deux jours à Paris.

Completion:
Claude a le nez rouge parce qu' (il a froid, il fait froid, il s'est réchauffé , il a trop bu.) M. Duchamps est allé à la boulangerie parce que (sa femme est malade, elle est à la maison avec les enfants, les enfants sont malades, ça ne va pas ce matin.) Généralement, on a le nez rouge (pour se réchauffer, quand on boit de l'alcool, quand il fait froid, pour boire du café.) Généralement, les trains français (sont à l'heure, sont en retard, arrivent à Paris, viennent du centre.) La jeune fille demande de l'argent au jeune homme parce qu' (elle s'ennuie, elle s'arrange, il lui doit de l'argent, il s'est débrouillé.)

ORAL EXAMINATION II

Les Vieux
1. Le fils est allé en Argentine pour travailler. 2. Jacques est allé en Amérique pour étudier. 3. Jacques et son frère écrivent souvent. 4. La vieille dame a beaucoup voyagé quand elle était jeune. 5. La vieille dame écrivait souvent pendant ses voyages. 6. Elle est partie une fois pendant trois jours.

Un rendez-vous
7. Michèle a déjà dîné. 8. Elle fait la vaisselle parce qu'il n'y a pas d'autre assiette. 9. Claude viendra la chercher dans une heure. 10. Michèle ne veut pas sortir ce soir.

Qui va faire la cuisine
11. La jeune femme ne sait pas faire la cuisine. 12. Le jeune homme a décidé de faire la cuisine. 13. Le jeune homme suggère de faire venir la mère de sa femme. 14. Le jeune homme cuisine le

dimanche et pendant les vacances. 15. La jeune femme est allée à l'université.

Gagner de l'argent
16. Claude gagne de l'argent en travaillant. 17. Le jeune homme veut emprunter de l'argent. 18. Il a perdu tout son argent. 19. Il n'aime pas travailler. 20. Le jour où il a épousé sa femme il a gagné.

Completion:
Le nouveau magasin intéresse la femme (à cause de la simplicité, parce qu'il y a de belles robes, parce qu'il est joli, à cause de son mari.) Le jeune mari ne veut pas aller au magasin parce que (la robe est simple, la robe coûte cher, il aime le parc, il plaît à sa femme.) Le mari se plaint parce que (sa femme lui sert des oeufs, sa mère va venir, il sait faire la cuisine, sa femme est vieille.) Le jeune homme veut emprunter de l'argent parce qu'il (ne peut pas trouver de travail, veut épouser sa femme, n'en a pas, a perdu sa femme.)

EXAM AFTER
Conversations 1-7

Fill in the words that are missing. These are taken from the thème d'imitation, a few lines out of several of them. If you did it well in your preparation you must know the missing element.

Conversation 1:
Vous savez ___ est l'école? Oui, ___ vais maintenant. ___ pouvons aller ___ ___ deux. Je ___ voir mon professeur ___ ___ heure. On ___ encore ___ demi-heure.

Conversation 2:
Passez, ___ ___ ___prie. ___ table-___? D'accord. Il ___ ___ a beaucoup. _________________ vous prenez? Je crois ___ ___ prends ___ vin. Le vin ___ ___ café ___ plaira. Je prends ___ bière. J'aime _______ la bière.

Conversation 3:
Qu'est-ce que ___ faites? Je ___ mathématiques. Je ___ ___ finir. J'___ encore ___ livres. Est-ce que vous ___ auriez ___? Quelle chance, j'aimerais ___ ___ avoir, si c'est toujours ___ mêmes. D'accord, ___ vous voulez. Je pourrai passer ___ prendre. Je ___ passer demain.

Conversation 5:
J'___ les livres. C'est ça ______ chambre? Mais c'est _____. ____ vous faites la cuisine? Je ___ fais ___ la cuisine. ___ est-ce que ___ mangez? J'___ trouvé un petit restaurant. ___ ___'appelle Chez Jean.

EXAM AFTER
Conversations 8-14

Answer the questions:
Conversation 8:
1. Qu'est-ce que Pierre a fait cet été? 2. Où a-t-il travaillé? 3. Pendant combien de temps a-t-il travaillé? 4. Que faisait-il au bureau? 5. Où a-t-il appris l'anglais? 6. Qu'a-t-il pu faire?

Conversation 9: (leaving for the university)
1. Qu'est-ce que Claude doit faire maintenant? 2. Pourquoi faut-il partir? 3. Avec qui a-t-il un cours? 4. Quand doit-il partir?

Conversation 10: (Mme Michu is sick)
1. De qui parle-t-on? 2. Pourquoi Mme Michu devrait-elle appeler le docteur? 3. Qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire quand on est malade? 4. De quoi ne doit-on pas se moquer? 5. Qui plaisante dans ce dialogue?

Conversation 11 (Baby is crying at night)
1. Qui a réveillé les parents? 2. Comment les a-t-il réveillés? 3. Que faut-il lui donner? 4. Pourquoi faut-il lui donner de l'eau?

Conversation 13 (Brother and sister - question of meeting a girl friend)
1. De quoi parle-t-on? 2. A qui s'intéresse-t-il? 3. Sous quelle condition va-t-elle la lui présenter?

EXAM AFTER
Conversations 15-22

Retell or recreate from memory the dialogue of your choice from among the above. Write clearly. To be corrected by your instructor.

GRAMMAR TEST I

Rewrite the sentences using the elements suggested in the line below. Make all the changes necessary in the new sentence.
1. Nous avons bien mangé hier au restaurant. (demain) 2. Je vais arriver à Paris demain soir. (hier) 3. Papa lit le journal dans la chambre. (Papa et maman) 4. Papa cherche sa chemise. (Maman... chapeau) 5. Le boucher du coin a vendu sa maison. (rue) 6. Papa a emmené sa pipe au bureau. (pas) 7. J'ai fait tous mes devoirs. (rien) 8. Hier papa a offert du vin à ses amis. (demain)
9. Vous avez du pain aujourd'hui? (pas) 10. J'ai vendu ma bicyclette au boucher. (épicière) 11. J'ai terminé mes devoirs. (Les enfants) 12. J'ai trouvé une belle petite blouse. (chapeau) 13. Je crois que maman arrivera demain. (Il faut) 14. La fille de ma soeur est grande. (Les fils) 15. Papa sait que je suis parti. (veut)

16. Je vais à New York demain matin. (Il faut) 17. J'ai décidé d'apprendre le français. (Je veux) 18. Je mange de la viande au restaurant. (J'aime) 19. Papa a toujours plusieurs pipes. (beaucoup) 20. Je les ai lus à la bibliothèque. (vais) 21. Je dois travailler à l'usine. (commence) 22. Je ne l'ai pas trouvé au bureau. (vais) 23. Qu'est-ce que vous avez vendu en ville? (allez) 24. Les enfants s'amusent bien aujourd'hui. (hier) 25. J'ai donné mon livre à l'enfant. (professeur) 26. Le professeur a dit que je comprends bien le français. (veut) 27. Ma fille travaille au magasin. (filles) 28. Le tablier de la petite fille est tombé. (garçon)

GRAMMAR TEST II

Write out the sentence using the stimulus suggested in the line below and making all the changes that are necessitated by this one change.

1. Un jeune lion grandissait dans sa cage. (Deux) 2. Des hommes sont venus et l'ont tué. (dans le futur) 3. Il croit que les hommes sont plus gentils. (Il faut) 4. Des visiteurs sont venus. (commencent) 5. Le dompteur est entré dans la cage. (a décidé) 6. Des spectateurs s'évanouissent maintenant. (hier) 7. Un spectateur s'est précipité vers la cage. (Des spectateurs) 8. Il tire un revolver de la poche. (pantalon) 9. J'ai raconté mes voyages. (Ils) 10. Je croyais que la maison était dans le jardin. (Il faut) 11. Elle a raconté l'histoire à la vieille dame. (monsieur) 12. La dame a vu les propriétaires. (pas) 13. Elle voulait trouver le château. (Elle savait) 14. Elle avait une robe rouge. (pas) 15. Irène a donné un coup de téléphone à l'épicière. (boucher) 16. J'ai dormi toute la nuit. (pas) 17. Je gagnerai toujours. (Dans le passé j') 18. L'ancien concierge veut une voiture. (Le concierge et sa femme) 19. Je me rendrai en ville la semaine prochaine. (hier) 20. Les deux agents entrent dans la maison du horzain aujourd'hui. (hier)

Answer the questions using the necessary pronouns.
21. Qui a mangé mon gâteau? 22. Est-ce que vous avez répondu au brigadier? 23. Vous avez zigouillé sa femme? 24. Qui a répondu aux agents? 25. Où est-ce que vous avez envoyé la malle? 26. Qui a trouvé des cerises? 27. Est-ce que l'agent vous a répondu? 28. Qui vous a insulté? 29. Qu'est-ce qu'on vous a apporté? 30. Qui vous a montré le télégramme?

GRAMMAR TEST III

Rewrite the sentences using the elements suggested. Make all the corrections necessary.
1. On y cultive des carottes et des choux. (Les paysans) 2. Le département est prospère. (Les) 3. C'est un beau petit village. (ville) 4. Aujourd'hui je me promène dans la ville. (Hier)

5. Les paysans boivent un apéritif au café. (On) 6. Je suis venu
hier. (demain) 7. On nous a offert du vin. (va) 8. C'est le
propriétaire du restaurant. (hôtel) 9. La ville change beaucoup
aujourd'hui. (dans le passé) 10. Elle parle à l'enfant. (enfants)

Fill the blank with the word needed to make sense.
11. Il est né ___ 22 Janvier. 12. Hier les enfants se ___ reposés.
13. L'école est au centre du village. L'enfant doit ___ aller.
14. Le professeur explique les devoirs ___ il faut faire à la
maison. 15. L'enfant fait ses devoirs. Demain il va ___ montrer
au professeur. 16. Marie ___ allée à l'école ce matin. 17. Les
enfants vont à l'école ___ 1er Octobre. 18. Les enfants font ___
devoirs chez ___. 19. Marie étudie le français ___ université.
20. On réussit en classe ___ étudiant. 21. Le professeur pose des
questions. Les enfants ___ répondent. 22. Ils apprennent la
discipline ___ école. 23. Les élèves respectent ___ instituteur.
24. Il faut ___ les élèves fassent ___ devoirs. 25. Les enfants
n'ont pas ___ livres. 26. Il faut toujours répondre ___ professeur.
27. Les parents doivent acheter beaucoup ___ livres. 28. Maman
a préparé de la soupe. Les enfants ___ mangent beaucoup. 29. Les
enfants ___ lavent le matin. 30. Ils se ___ couchés hier soir.
31. Il faut donner de la soupe ___ enfants. 32. L'école est
l'institution ___ l'enfant apprend la discipline. 33. Je vais
rentrer chez ___. 34. J'aime beaucoup ___ vin. 35. On sert souvent
___ café. 36. L'attitude ___ institutrices est sévère. 37. On
explique la grammaire ___ enfant. 38. Les enfants commencent
___ apprendre les mathématiques. 39. ___ est-ce que vous parlez?
40. Marie porte ___ chapeau.

GRAMMAR TEST IV

Fill in the blank spaces. Each represents one little word. Fill
them in according to sense and grammatical correctness. The words
left out are: one of the articles, a pronoun, or an auxiliary
verb.
1. Une dame ___ entrée dans le bureau ___ gendarme. Elle voulait
parler ___ commissaire de police ___ elle connaissait bien.
2. ___ s'appelait Mme Roux. Elle possédait ___ maison dans le
village. 3. Elle ___ a louée à une famille ___ s'appelait Fire.
Les Fire ___ donné ___ argent à Mme Roux pour sa maison. 4. Mme
Fire ___ sortie le matin pour acheter ___ légumes. 5. M. Fire ne
sortait ___. Il restait dans ___ appartement. 6. Mme Roux ne ___
voyait jamais. 7. Un jour Mme Fire ___ partie. La petite dame
___ disparu. 8. La dame ___ arrivée chez le commissaire de police.
Elle voulait ___ parler. 9. Elle ___ a dit: Une dame a loué
___ maison. Elle ___ a donné de l'argent. ___ mari est un mauvais
caractère. Je ne ___ vois jamais. C'est mystérieux. Hier Mme
Fire ___ disparu. Je ___ la vois plus. 10. Je crois ___ il y a
un crime. Il faut que M. Fire ___ le criminel. Il a tué ___ femme.
11. Le commissaire de police a décidé ___ aller ___ maison.
12. Il ___ est allé avec le brigadier. 13. Il ___ entré dans ___
maison. Il ___ trouvé M. Fire. 14. M. Fire ___ reposait dans

___ fauteuil. Il lisait ___ journal. 15. Le commissaire ___ a demandé: Où est ___ femme? 16. M. Fire n'a ___ compris. Le commissaire ___ emmené M. Fire à la prison. 17. Mme Fire ___ venue. Elle a parlé ___ commissaire de police. Elle ___ a demandé: Où est ___ mari? 18. Elle a dit: ___ suis allée à Paris. Et ___ reviens par le train. ___ mari n'est pas un criminel.

Rewrite the following sentences using the element suggested. Make all the necessary changes.
19. Marie s'amuse. (Les enfants) 20. L'étudiant lit un livre. (Le professeur veut) 21. J'ai fait mes devoirs. (J'ai décidé) 22. Je me repose aujourd'hui. (Hier) 23. J'ai parlé à la dame. (professeur) 24. J'ai trouvé le chapeau de la dame. (monsieur) 25. J'ai réparé ma bicyclette. (Les enfants) 26. J'ai mangé de la soupe. (pas) 28. Il a bu du vin hier. (Demain) 29. Il viendra demain. (hier). 30. Je partirai. (Il faut)

GRAMMAR TEST V

Fill in the missing element:
1. Louis XIV est un roi de France ___ a gouverné la France au 17e siècle. 2. Versailles est le château ___ le roi tenait sa cour. 3. Le château de Versailles ___ splendide. 4. Louis XIV était le plus puissant ___ Europe. 5. Louis XIV fait la guerre ___ protestants. 6. Beaucoup ___ protestants ___ partis de la France. 7. Ils se ___ réfugiés en Allemagne. 8. Louis XIV ___ mort en 1715. 9. Les Anglais ___ attaqué la France. 10. La France a perdu ___ colonies sous Louis XV. 11. Sous Louis XV La France n'avait pas ___ influence en Europe. 12. Sous Louis XVI la France n'avait pas ___ argent. 13. Les troupes ___ Napoléon commandaient ont conquis l'Europe. 14. Napoléon était le chef ___ armées françaises. 15. Napoléon ___ attaqué toute l'Europe.

Change the sentences using the elements suggested:
16. Napoléon a battu les Russes. (Les Français) 17. On a exilé Napoléon à l'île d'Elbe. (Les Anglais) 18. Lafayette s'est établi en Amérique. (Des Français) 19. L'impératrice est la femme de l'empéreur. (La reine, roi) 20. Le peuple s'est révolté contre la monarchie. (Les Français)

READING EXAM
Le Bourgeois, No. 11

Answer with one expression only - no sentences needed, Use the dittoed text you have.
1. Quelle mentalité caractérise la classe bourgeoise? 2. Quelle est l'occupation professionnelle de beaucoup de nobles? 3. Quelles sont les occupations professionnelles de la moyenne bourgeoisie? 4. Qu'est-ce que la femme porte comme protection de ses vêtements? 5. Pourquoi est-ce que le bourgeois économise? 6. Donnez une définition du bourgeois. 7. Quelles sont les réserves du bourgeois?

8. Qu'est-ce qui est respecté dans la société française? 9. Pourquoi est-ce que le restaurateur parisien ne reste pas ouvert le week-end? 10. Comment (how) est-ce que l'enfant doit prendre soin de ses vêtements? 11. Qu'est-ce qu'on fait à la bibliothèque? 12. Qu'est-ce qui intéresse le bourgeois français? 13. Qu'est-ce qu'on peut trouver dans les petites villes françaises? 14. A quoi la bonne chambre est-elle reservée?

READING EXAM
Le Paysan, No. 12

You may use your printed text. Give short answers:
1. Quel est le pourcentage de la population qui habite la campagne en France? 2. Qu'est-ce qui est une religion? 3. Que fait le paysan le dimanche? 4. Où habite le paysan français? 5. Où est-ce qu'on produit le blé? 6. De quoi se servent les paysans de la Beauce?
7. Quelle est la dimension de la majorité des fermes françaises?
8. Qu'est-ce qu'on ne peut pas employer sur une petite ferme?
9. Où est-ce que les champs sont situés? 10. Quelle est la condition économique du paysan? 11. Quel trait de caractère distingue le paysan? 12. Quelle est la condition économique de l'intermédiaire?
13. Quel est le commandement divin? 14. Comment les Français l'ont-ils changé? 15. Pourquoi est-ce qu'un "barn-raising" n'est pas possible en France? 16. Qu'est-ce qui constitue le centre de la ferme? 17. Quelles sont les causes de cette attitude méfiante? 18. Quels changements a-t-on fait?

READING EXAM
L'Ouvrier, No. 13

You may use your texts for answering.
1. Pourquoi est-ce qu'on n'aime pas les maisons fabriquées en série? 2. De quoi est-ce que le patron est le symbol? 3. Où est-ce que les clochards habitent? 4. Comment l'ouvrier vote-t-il?
5. Qu'est-ce qu'on loue? 6. Est-ce que les appartements des ouvriers sont assez grands? 7. Dans quelles usines est-ce que la majorité des ouvriers français travaillent? 8. Qu'est-ce que les assurances sociales paient? (3 things) 9. De quoi l'ouvrier est enthousiaste?
10. Pourquoi est-ce que l'ouvrier n'aime pas travailler dans une grande usine? 11. Qu'est-ce que c'est qu'un clochard? 12. Qu'est-ce qui attire les clochards? 13. Contre quoi est-ce que les clochards se révoltent? 14. Pourquoi est-ce que le parti communiste n'a pas beaucoup de partisans? 15. Que signifie le vote communiste de l'ouvrier?

READING EXAM
Le Gouvernement Français, No. 14

1. Quelle est la responsabilité du parlement? 2. Quel est le pouvoir du Président français? 3. De quoi le Président français est-il responsable? 4. Quelle est la responsabilité du fonctionnaire?
5. Comment est-ce que le gouvernement de Paris administre les

activités locales? 6. Comment est-ce qu'on caractérise le fonctionnaire? 7. Pourquoi est-ce qu'on ridicule le fonctionnaire? 8. Quelle est l'attitude du Français envers le politicien? 9. Qu'est-ce que le gouvernement de Paris contrôle? 10. A qui faut-il s'adresser pour recevoir de l'argent pour construire une école? 11. Qui peut aider le Français quand il ne reçoit pas satisfaction du fonctionnaire? 12. Comment les Français se vengent-ils? 13. Qu'est-ce qu'on veut éviter? 14. Qu'est-ce qui donne satisfaction au Français? 15. Est-ce que les Français sont patriotiques? 16. Qu'est-ce qu'ils n'aiment pas? 17. Qui blâme-t-on pour les petites irritations de chaque jour?

READING EXAM
Le Foyer, No. 15

1. Qu'est-ce que le gouvernement contribue au budget familial? 2. Qu'est-ce qu'on faisait autrefois dans la cheminée? 3. Comment le Français évite-t-il de payer des impôts? 4. De quoi ne faut-il jamais parler? 5. A qui le foyer est-il fermé? 6. Qui invite-t-on au foyer? 7. Qu'est-ce qui démontre qu'on est un ami intime d'une famille? 8. Qu'est-ce qui symbolise la sécurité du foyer? 9. Quelle est l'attitude du Français envers le foyer? 10. Qu'est-ce qui illustre l'attitude du Français envers les étrangers? 11. Pourquoi ne veut-on pas d'étrangers au foyer? 12. Quand est-ce que la famille se réunit au foyer?

Write a paragraph using the following vocabulary items. You need not use them in the sequence in which they are presented. FROM MEMORY.
se marier, élever, faire du feu, chauffer, hiver, se réunir, admettre, inviter, protéger, les autres, les disputes, un secret, garder.

READING EXAM
L'Esprit Français, No. 16

1. De quel trait de caractère est-ce que le Français est fier? 2. Qui dans la société française est respectée? 3. Pourquoi est-ce que les Français admirent le Général de Gaulle? 4. Quelle est l'attitude du Français envers le français? 5. Quel est le résultat de l'amour du Français envers la logique? 6. Pourquoi est-ce que les Français ont eu cinq constitutions? 7. Démontrez l'amour de l'intelligence dans la vie de tous les jours? 8. Comment est-ce que les journaux démontrent que le Français aime l'intellectualisme? 9. Qu'est-ce que les Français n'aiment pas à cause de leur intellectualisme? 10. Qu'est-ce que le chauffeur de taxi a fait au croisement? 11. Comment est-ce qu'il justifie son action? 12. Quel est son argument pour démontrer qu'il respecte la loi? 13. Pourquoi ne veut-il pas obéir à une machine? 14. Sur quoi est-ce que les Français insistent?
Give a little summary using the following words:
poursuivre, prévoir, convaincre, mépriser, avoir besoin, avoir honte, ralentir, regarder, brûler un feu rouge, obéir, circuler.

READING EXAM
Les Sports, No. 17

1. Comment se manifeste l'individualisme du Français dans les sports? 2. Quand y a-t-il des matchs de football? 3. Quelle est la course cycliste la plus importante? 4. Que porte le cycliste qui gagne? 5. Quels sports fait-on dans les montagnes? 6. Qu'est-ce qu'un alpiniste veut faire? 7. Où est-ce qu'on fait de la natation? 8. Qui pratique le tennis? 9. Pourquoi est-ce que le tennis n'est pas un sport répandu? 10. Quel sport peut-on voir à un hippodrome? 11. Qu'est-ce qui attire aussi la foule? 12. Dans quelle ville se termine la Tour de France? 13. Quel événement marque un changement de l'attitude française envers les sports? 14. Quel esprit est important pour un jeu d'équippe? 15. Comment est-ce que les jeunes gens passent souvent la nuit en été?

READING EXAM
La France en Voiture, No. 18

1. Qu'est-ce qui caractérise le conducteur français? 2. Quelle est son attitude envers les piétons? 3. En quoi a-t-il confiance? 4. Quel en est souvent le résultat? 5. Qui d'après le code français peut passer avant les autres? 6. Quels sont les signaux qu'on emploie la nuit? 7. Quand faut-il ralentir? 8. Où est-ce que le Français aime conduire? 9. Que faut-il faire pour qu'il se range à droite? 10. Qui sont les lambins? 11. Qui sont les timorés? 12. Que signifie les signes qu'ils échangent? 13. Pourquoi la petite Renault a dû freiner? 14. Pourquoi le coup de sifflet? 15. Quelle aurait été la réaction de l'agent s'il avait été dans cette situation?

READING EXAM
La France Change de Visage, No. 19

1. Qu'est-ce qui a changé les vieilles traditions? 2. Comment est-ce que l'importance du passé a été réduit? 3. Quel problème a résulté de l'explosion de la population? 4. De quoi a-t-on besoin pour loger la population? 5. Qu'est-ce que c'est que le matérialisme? 6. Pourquoi a-t-on besoin d'une voiture? 7. Comment est-ce que la guerre a influencé les nouvelles tendances? 8. Quand peut-on voir un embouteillage? 9. Pourquoi y a-t-il un embouteillage? 10. Qu'est-ce qui marque le confort dans l'appartement moderne? 11. Pourquoi est-ce que les vieux ne voulaient pas acheter à crédit? 12. Dans quels domaines est-ce que les Français commencent à collaborer? 13. Comment est-ce qu'on peut voir les changements dans la vie dans la langue française? 14. Quelle est l'influence qui s'exerce sur le français? 15. Qu'est-ce qui est responsable de beaucoup de ces changements?

FINAL TEST RESULTS - EXPERIMENTAL, FIRST YEAR (DAY)

	CO-OP ENGLISH			ACT	SAT	SCAT	APT.	FINAL MLA			
	V	S	L	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent	L	S	R	W
1.							40	42	73	27	1
2.	73	75	52		V496 M513		40				
3.	37	69	59	68			95	45	73	15	40
4.					V450 M408		45	71	89	68	73
5.							40	16	73	32	25
6.				24			97	60	98	58	86
7.	38	52	37	21			65	60	89	32	40
8.							95				
9.	19	41	17	26			25				
10.	8	14	25				10				
11.	78	83	91	91			99	80	73	63	73
12.	84	87	59	75			90				
13.							95				
14.					V462 M637		45	77	76	50	33
15.	50	57	59			89	45				
16.	61	62	27		V641 M668		55	92	97	20	67
17.	78	87	91	73			90				
18.	61	75	88	69			70	92	94	68	73
19.	61	17	41	40			55	45	98	32	58
20.				91			85	45	94	50	25
21.	30	59	41	54			15				
22.							70				
23.	61	52	56	55			35	71	73	43	33
24.				95			95				
25.	73	77	27	69			20				
26.	20	9	18			80	15	80	99	32	31
27.								80	97	78	37
28.								80	97	58	73
							MEAN	64.7	87.0	45.3	53.9

FINAL TEST RESULTS - EXPERIMENTAL, FIRST YEAR (NIGHT)

	CO-OP ENGLISH			ACT	SAT	SCAT	APT.	FINAL MLA			
	V	S	L	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent	L	S	R	W
1.							15	42	84	50	87
2.							30	84	98	68	67
3.	61	96	82	26			70				
4.							20				
5.							50				
6.							40				
7.	70	80	88			80	60				
8.							80				
9.							15	69	94	63	81
10.							25	60	73	43	10
11.							15				
12.							45				
13.							40				
14.							60				
15.	52	68	62	9			55	42	64	27	10
16.							10				
17.							30				
18.							97				
19.							15	87	99	78	100
20.							70				
21.							70				
22.	50	65	48			48		56	94	43	40
23.							30	96	97	81	93
24.	70	12	59			93	95	37	73	50	46
25.							60				
26.				39			20	27	76	50	46
27.							50				
28.							95				
29.	45	46	52			89	15				
30.							20	56	57	63	67
31.							5				
32.							35				
33.							25				
34.				82			65				
MEAN								59.3	82.6	56.0	58.8

FINAL TEST RESULTS - CONTROL, FIRST YEAR

	CO-OP ENGLISH			ACT	SAT	SCAT	APT.	FINAL MLA			
	V	S	L	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent	L	S	R	W
1.				69							
2.	62	64	66			80	75	92	76	78	73
3.	52	41	27		V423 M460		45	71	87	68	67
4.	78	62	48		V554 M381		35				
5.	78	69	68	87			85	87	98	92	73
6.	37	22	7	22			15				
7.	61	77	87	91			95	60	76	63	46
8.	94	42	36				85	27	64	68	18
9.					V496 M532		30				
10.	92	91	75	87			60				
11.	88	69	82	21			10	42	47	32	4
12.	52	77	82		V388 M445		50				
13.	46	41	37	68			35	37	64	58	33
14.					V575 M632		55				
15.					V394 M408		70				
16.	46	41	48	85			45	56	73	58	18
17.	80	64	66			68	55				
18.	84	77	75	76			25				
19.					V484 M648		50				
20.	88	96	82	95			99	84	94	86	93
21.	38	27	27	55			35				
22.				54			25				
23.	78	69	82	82			60				
24.					V592 M541		80				
25.	61	75	52		V431 M422		35				

FINAL TEST RESULTS - CONTROL, FIRST YEAR (CONT.)

	CO-OP ENGLISH			ACT	SAT	SCAT	APT.	FINAL MLA			
	V	S	L	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent	L	S	R	W
26.							40				
27.	73	59	41	91			50	96	84	78	67
28.							25				
29.				20			20	12	26	1	--
30.	37	27	9	18			10				
31.	1	2	2		V272 M424		5				
32.	52	62	82		V444 M547		25				
33.				39			20				
34.	78	32	17	54			65	45	76	38	2
35.							50				
36.	61	62	59	48			75				
37.	78	96	87	81			40				
38.					V563 M645		30	80	89	58	97
39.					V374 M640		40				
40.	73	37	52	91			80	84	84	86	67
41.				40			25				
42.	61	59	27	17			5				
43.	61	77	72		V483 M646		70				
44.				95	V505 M616		30				
45.	54	27	16				45	87	84	97	93
46.	46	14	13	40			25				
47.	46	51	75	5			15				
48.							30	96	98	99	96
49.				20			30				
50.	77	80	84			62	35				
51.	66	59	88			84	90	92	76	97	67

FINAL TEST RESULTS - CONTROL, FIRST YEAR (CONT.)

	CO-OP ENGLISH			ACT	SAT	SCAT	APT.	FINAL MLA			
	V	S	L	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent	L	S	R	W
52.	61	83	82	91							
53.	37	77	59	52			99	60	89	81	73
54.	68	52	64	87			40	87	89	68	50
55.	68	96	91	87			85	71	87	50	40
56.	68	69	48	48			20	96	89	81	93
57.	52	87	77	60			40				
58.	37	69	68	37			35				
59.	92	69	84	97			15				
60.							95	98	92	86	99.2
61.							25				
62.							15				
63.							45	84	92	86	87
64.							55				
65.							5				
66.							55	84	76	68	81
67.							45				
68.	53	69	99	24			90	69	57	63	18
69.							30				
70.								92	94	58	58
71.								87	92	81	93
72.								87	99	92	99.2
73.								77	76	68	58
74.								60	84	86	2
								84	76	78	87

FINAL TEST RESULTS - EXPERIMENTAL, SECOND YEAR

	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
1.	92	94	97	99
2.	69	91	33	19
3.	69	68	22	30
4.	12	40	54	9
5.	85	68	68	21
6.	92	91	97	89
7.	87	91	76	71
8.	65	80	68	39
9.	60	80	68	39
10.	87	75	33	5
11.	74	91	54	39
12.	60	91	89	71
13.	53	72	76	58
14.	44	72	33	30
15.	92	80	81	80
16.	87	94	97	94
17.	65	40	45	50
18.	53	80	33	50
MEAN	69.2	77.6	62.4	49.6

FINAL TEST RESULTS - CONTROL, SECOND YEAR

	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
1.	89	97	81	88
2.	74	72	45	21
3.	89	80	76	85
4.	74	63	10	25
5.	89	80	45	30
6.	89		86	6
7.	35	63	81	57
8.	92	94	93	94
9.	93	97	93	94
10.	74	68	81	25
11.	69	56	28	43
12.	87	80	54	68
13.	44	90	17	30
14.	92	80	68	43
15.	74	94	39	68
16.	78		68	57
17.	97	91	97	90
18.	53	90	17	7
19.	99	80	97	99
20.	12	6	76	89
21.	44	53	54	89
22.	74	63	76	93
23.	69	56	54	54
24.	78	40	45	71

FINAL TEST RESULTS - CONTROL, SECOND YEAR (CONT.)

	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
25.	97	72	97	93
26.	60	22	22	71
27.	92	72	81	71
28.	74	80	54	50
29.	87	75	92	68
30.	74	80	68	85
31.	69	75	81	57
32.	69	63	81	77
33.	28	80	93	57
34.	65	68	22	30
35.	97	91	92	90
36.	78	63	45	77
37.	95	95	97	88
38.	93	95	76	93
39.	89	91	68	93
40.	87	95	86	89
41.	78	91	68	71
42.	65	40	54	88
43.	53	63	45	84
44.	78	56	17	58
45.	69	56	45	58
46.	89	90	76	89
47.	78	63	54	45
48.	89	72	39	30
49.	65	56	33	71
50.	92	94	33	54
51.	92	91	76	57
52.	89	94	68	98
53.	78	80	54	43
54.	87	90	68	50
55.	74	63	68	43
56.	0.3	22	4	6
57.	35	40	39	7
58.	65	80	54	25
59.	44	63	59	43
60.	87	75	39	68
61.	87	48	68	85
62.	87	80	76	89
63.	92	80	81	89
64.	74	95	28	71
65.	92	80	93	89
66.	6	72	15	33
67.	87	94	76	88
68.	87	80	97	84
MEAN	74.2	73.0	61.2	63.6